

1

2

3

4

5

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

6

GOING-TO-THE-SUN ROAD ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

7

PURSUANT TO THE

8

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

EAST GLACIER LODGE - EAST GLACIER
GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, MONTANA

18

19

20

21

22

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2001

1:10 P.M. TO 6:15 P.M.

23

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2000

8:00 A.M. TO 6:35 P.M.

24

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2001

8:00 A.M. TO 2:15 P.M.

25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 ADVISORY COMMITTEE COORDINATORS:

3 Mary Ansotegui Glacier National Park
 4 Dayna Hudson Glacier National Park
 5 Deb Hervol Glacier National Park

6 FACILITATOR:

7 Virginia Tribe Missoula, MT

8 ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

9 Linda Anderson Executive Director Glacier Country
 Regional Tourism Commission - Bigfork, MT
 10 Brian Baker Waterton Lakes National Park
 Tourism Operator - Alberta, Canada
 11 Roscoe Black Owner St. Mary Lodge and Resort -
 St. Mary, MT
 12 Joni Stewart Glacier Action Involvement Now -
 Cut Bank, MT
 13 Bill Dakin Realtor - Columbia Falls, MT
 David Jackson Economist - University of Montana
 14 School of Forestry - Missoula, MT
 Tony Jewett Regional Director for National
 Parks Conservation Association - Helena, MT
 15 Jayne Kremenik Alberta Community Development -
 Alberta, Canada
 Tom McDonald Confederated Salish/Kootenai Tribes
 16 Pablo, MT
 Lowell Meznarch Glacier County Commissioner - Cut
 17 Bank, MT
 Anna Marie Moe Industry & Operations Manager -
 18 Travel Montana - Helena, MT
 Randy Ogle (Committee Chairman)
 19 Attorney - OGLE & WORM - Kalispell, MT
 Barney O'Quinn Engineer - ARCADIS, Geraghty &
 20 Miller - Fuquay-Varina, NC
 Barbara Pahl Regional Director Mountain/Plains
 21 Office of National Trust for Preservation - Denver, CO
 Don White Blackfeet Tribe - Browning, MT

22

23

24 COURT REPORTER:

25 Bambi Goodman, CSR, RPR, CRR Goodman Reporting,
 Whitefish, MT

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 WASHINGTON INFRASTRUCTURE PERSONNEL:

3 Jo Kracum Project Manager - Transportation
 4 Nick Senn Planning - Denver, CO
 5 Mark Bancale Engineering Team - Denver, CO
 6 Engineering Team - Denver, CO

7 Mark Hufstetler Renewable Technologies, Inc.

8 Jean Townsend Socioeconomic Expert -
 9 Coley/Forrest, Inc.

10 FEDERAL HIGHWAYS ADMINISTRATION PERSONNEL:

11 Dick Gatten Design Operations Engineer

12 Ron Carmichael Federal Lands Highway Division

13
 14 GLACIER NATIONAL PARK PERSONNEL:

15 Suzann Lewis Superintendent
 16 Fred Babb Project Manager
 17 Denis Davis Assistant Superintendent

18 --o0o--

19 PUBLIC COMMENT:

20 Philip Crissman Director, Burlington Northern
 21 Environmental Stewardship Area - Kalispell, MT

22 *Mary Erickson Microtel Inn & Suites -
 23 Missoula, MT

24 *Glacier Raft Co. West Glacier, MT

25 * (As read into the record by Deb Hervol)

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Wednesday, September 19, 2001 -	Page
3	Opening Comments and Rememberance	
4	by Chairman Ogle	6
5	Introduction by Facilitator Tribe	8
6	Joe Kracum -	
7	Engineering Study	
8	Report & Discussion	10
9	Jean Townsend -	
10	Socioeconomic Surveys	
11	Report & Discussion	58
12	Linda Anderson -	
13	Supplemental Socioeconomic Report	81
14	Committee reverification of Objective 1	85
15	--o0o--	
16	Public Comment -	
17	Philip Crissman	87
18	*Mary Erickson	99
19	*Glacier Raft Co.	99

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Thursday, September 20, 2001 -	Page
3	Fred Babb -	
4	Explanation of Terms	114
5	Work Group Presentations & Discussion	
6	re: Proposed Actions	132
7	Work Group Presentations & Discussion	
8	re: Proposed Engineering Alternatives	154
9	Work Group Presentations & Discussion	
10	re: Mitigation Strategies	303
11	--o0o--	
12		
13	Friday, September 21, 2001 -	
14	Review and Discussion of -	
15	Draft Alternative Recommendations	327
16	Review and Discussion of -	
17	Draft Proposed Actions	393
18	Review and Discussion of -	
19	Draft Visitor Development Strategies	411
20	November 15, 2001 - Agenda discussion	454
21	Review and Ratification of Draft Advice	462
22	Closing remarks by Chairman Ogle	483
23	Closing remarks by Superintendent Lewis	483
24	Closing remarks by Facilitator Tribe	483
25	--o0o--	

1 The first day of the third meeting of the
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee was called to order
3 at 1:05 p.m., Wednesday, September 19, 2001, by Randy Ogle,
4 Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

5 Chairman Ogle welcomes everyone, including members
6 of the public who are in attendance, thanking all for
7 attending the meeting, given the tragedy of September 11,
8 just one week prior to this meeting taking place.

9 Along with the events of September 11, Chairman
10 Ogle speaks to a personal tragedy within the Committee, that
11 of the death of Committee member, Paul Sliter.

12 Paul was a very remarkable individual. After
13 graduating from the University of Montana, he was an
14 assistant to Senator Burns. He ran for the Montana
15 legislature at the age of twenty-four. He spent four terms
16 in the House of Representatives in the Montana legislature,
17 and he was finishing his fourth term at the time of his
18 death when he was the majority leader in the Montana State
19 House of Representatives. He had accomplished all of this
20 by the age of thirty-two years.

21 Most will remember Paul was a proud husband and
22 father.

23 Paul was also a vital member of this Committee.
24 He was a visionary. He realized the importance of the
25 Going-to-the-Sun Road in Montana and the surrounding area

1 and was a quick study. He grasped the issues and was able
2 to address those right from the beginning. He was a very
3 bright, very articulate man, but he was able to bring a
4 sense of humor to his tasks. He had a brilliant smile, and
5 he will not be forgotten.

6 Chairman Ogle then asks all present to join him in
7 a moment of silence in Paul's memory.

8 (Pause for a moment of silence.)

9 Chairman Ogle then welcomes two new members of the
10 Committee; Roscoe Black and Joni Stewart.

11 Joni Stewart is with Glacier Action Involvement
12 Now in Cut Bank, which is an economic development group.
13 She replaces Mary Sexton's place on the Committee,
14 representing the eastern business district.

15 Roscoe Black is owner of the Resort at St. Mary.
16 He took Will Brooks's place on the Committee, representing
17 the businesses on the eastern side of the mountains.

18 Chairman Ogle requests that each Committee member
19 introduce themselves and state where they're from and what
20 they bring to the Committee for the benefit of Roscoe and
21 Joni, which is done by each committee member.

22 Chairman Ogle then introduces Virginia Tribe,
23 facilitator of this meeting. Ms. Tribe asks that the other
24 personnel in attendance introduce themselves for the benefit
25 of everyone here: Bambi Goodman, Jean Townsend, Fred Babb,

1 Mary Ansotegui, Dayna Hudson, and Joe Kracum introduce
2 themselves, noting that Joe Kracum is new to the Committee
3 and is the current project manager on the studies for this
4 project.

5 Ms. Tribe introduces herself. She used to be a
6 seventh and eighth grade teacher in the '60s. She is a
7 mother of seven. She lives in Missoula, Montana, and has
8 had her own company for about thirteen years. She does
9 facilitation for all kinds of organizations, and she works
10 about 200 days a year. Some of her clients are at the
11 table, besides this advisory group, so it's nice to see many
12 she's worked with in the past as well as new folks.

13 There is a lot of work to be done in less than two
14 days. The following objectives are to be accomplished:

15 The first objective is to have the Committee
16 affirm, again, the need for rehabilitation of the road.

17 The second objective is to take a look at the
18 proposed actions that are related to the needs and develop
19 some sense of making recommendations about priorities
20 related to those proposed actions.

21 The third objective is to look at alternatives and
22 give the contractors and the Park Service some feeling, at
23 least in a draft sense, about how the Committee feels, in
24 terms of acceptable alternatives for the road.

25 The fourth objective is to make some set of

1 recommendations related to mitigation measures for those
2 acceptable alternatives.

3 This meeting is to complete the bulk of the work
4 necessary to submit a memo by Chairman Ogle. The meeting on
5 the 15th of November will be the time when the Committee
6 will finalize their recommendations, based on any other
7 input that comes in for them to review.

8 Ms. Tribe reminds the Committee of their Charter
9 and that their position is one of advisory, not decision
10 making.

11 Ms. Tribe then addresses the members of the
12 public, welcoming them. She reminds them this is a public
13 meeting, which means it's open, but it is not open for
14 interaction between Committee members and members of the
15 public as the Committee goes about its business. And for
16 that reason, public testimony time has been scheduled on the
17 agenda so that the Committee will be able to hear public
18 comments. However, no interaction will be allowed during
19 deliberation by the Committee.

20 Ms. Tribe requests ground rules for safe but
21 productive discussion. She's talking about safe in terms of
22 people being able to say what people need to say, questions
23 answered that they need answered. She asks for input from
24 the Committee members establishing ground rules for
25 discussion and vote, along with the format and wording the

1 draft alternative recommendations will take.

2 It was discussed and agreed the Committee will
3 present alternatives based on consensus; that minority
4 and/or differing opinion/comments by Committee members will
5 be included somewhere in the draft alternative
6 recommendations; that the Committee will address
7 alternatives as per their Charter, and may include
8 additional comments/recommendations they would like to see
9 considered in the alternatives that may be outside the
10 direct authority of the Park Service.

11 Ms. Tribe then reiterates the Charter of the
12 Committee: The purpose of the Committee is to advise the
13 National Park Service in the development of alternatives for
14 rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road in Glacier
15 National Park, focusing on road condition and rehabilitation
16 strategies, including scheduling, cost and measures to
17 mitigate impacts on visitors and local economies.

18 Ms. Tribe then invites Joe Kracum, project manager
19 from Washington Infrastructure, to give his presentation.

20 Mr. Kracum introduces himself as the project
21 manager for the Going-to-the-Sun Road project work at this
22 point. His home is in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, and the
23 bulk of his experience has been in resorts and
24 environmentally-sensitive terrain.

25 He explains that this contract was initially with

1 MK Centennial, and that a year ago the company's name was
2 changed to Washington Infrastructure Services, named after
3 Dennis Washington. He actually purchased MK Centennial back
4 in the mid '90s, and with the purchase of another company
5 last year, it was decided that a name change was in order.

6 Joe's involvement started the end of March. There
7 were changes in the project management, and he was given the
8 opportunity to take over the project management from Craig
9 Gaskill and the team out of Denver.

10 This team's work is to produce planning documents,
11 a socioeconomic study and transportation and visitor use
12 study. Today he has the task of addressing those studies.

13 Jean Townsend continued her work on the
14 socioeconomic study and the transportation visitor use
15 study. Also present from the Glenwood Springs office is
16 Nick Senn. Mr. Senn offers a tremendous amount of
17 experience in construction cost estimating constructability
18 and scheduling. He's here for the more technical questions
19 for costs and schedules. Also here, from Renewable
20 Technologies, is Mark Hufstetler, who provided historical
21 information throughout the process.

22 Mr. Kracum explains the engineering company is
23 producing a planning-level document. The next step would be
24 to take it to an Environmental Impact Statement. After
25 that, preliminary design of the individual sites would be

1 developed into final design, and then after that into the
2 rehabilitation.

3 One of the charges within the Charter was to look
4 at the conditions of the road from an engineering
5 standpoint. The past studies have been confirmed. The
6 first team on the job did a conditions assessment. And
7 after arrival in March, Mr. Kracum decided he wanted to
8 bring a few of the key construction people to take a look at
9 the road. Eight people were in the Park spending a week on
10 the road going through all the individual pieces.

11 For reference, the individual studies of the road
12 during that week are listed in Appendix A (contained within
13 the Engineering Study provided to the Committee before this
14 date) and show, piece by piece, all of the information that
15 was gathered. Part of the study shows what the problem is,
16 the basic fix and a rough magnitude of what that would
17 entail. This information then is carried forward into
18 Appendix B (also contained within the Engineering Study
19 provided) which takes the detailed cost estimates, carries
20 them forward into the scheduling of the work, that all being
21 folded into the recommendations.

22 Mr. Kracum explains it's a very complex process to
23 cost and schedule something like this project with so many
24 different alternatives for each site, in terms of safety, in
25 terms of drainage, in terms of slope stability, the

1 historical and cultural impacts, and the environmental
2 impacts. So in giving a set of alternatives that combines
3 those pieces, Joe is going to spend some time on that today,
4 because it can be a confusing process.

5 If there's one message Mr. Kracum would like to
6 leave the Committee with today, in particular, it's that the
7 road is still deteriorating, still getting worse. Just in
8 the one year from the last investigation that the engineers
9 have done to the one that was done this year, there is
10 additional deterioration. That deterioration will continue
11 until corrective measures are made.

12 In particular, drainage is the key issue. It gets
13 cold and water freezes. And when water gets into the
14 pavement, when water gets into the subbases, when it gets
15 into the guard walls and the retaining walls, it tends to
16 freeze at night, thaw in the day, and that action on those
17 structures tends to push things apart.

18 In the studies, the recommendation has been made,
19 both in terms of maintenance and operations, as well as an
20 action that's needed now, is something needs to be done now.
21 Maintenance needs to be increased. The allocation for
22 funding needs to be increased, so these things don't get any
23 worse over the period of time. And recommendations were
24 made that even during this process of environmental
25 clearance, that if there's a possibility to add more

1 allocation of money to the maintenance and operations, that
2 would help the overall rehabilitation efforts and the
3 overall integrity of the road.

4 With the recommendations that were made,
5 Washington Infrastructure is also looking at providing
6 alternatives, solutions, that not only fix the road but give
7 a long-term integrity on the road so that repairs to the
8 same area are not needed in a couple of years.

9 The scope of work entailed reviewing the
10 alternatives; to restore the road, minimize the effects on
11 natural, cultural and scenic resources.

12 The team has been challenged in other areas of
13 this country, especially in the mountains in environmentally
14 sensitive terrain, to come up with fixes to things and, at
15 the same time, don't impact anybody, don't impact the
16 environment, don't impact the visitors, don't impact the
17 historic natures. So this is work that this team has been
18 involved with in most of their careers.

19 There have been no significant changes to the
20 road. There will be particular rock fall areas with regard
21 to safety. They have suggested a realignment for a few
22 hundred feet in order to address slope stability issues.
23 But other than that, there's no significant change to the
24 character or fabrication width.

25 During the field reconnaissance done this summer,

1 an historical and cultural expert was taken to every site
2 that was looked at, and the team tried to get a good
3 recommendation on what can and can't be done, in terms of
4 historic and cultural changes or rehabilitation efforts.
5 Those were incorporated in the report.

6 It is strongly recommended during the design
7 process and, as well, during the construction process of
8 each of these individual sites, that some level of historic
9 and cultural expertise be provided during that design and
10 construction effort. Because there's going to need to be
11 decisions made, maybe on a monthly basis, on the specific
12 rehabilitation site, it is recommended a historian be
13 involved in the project.

14 The team is providing solutions intended to
15 provide the Committee with what the engineers call a long
16 life cycle, which would mean that basically your operations
17 and maintenance costs tend to be lower.

18 There is indicated in the engineering report
19 priority rehabilitations in several areas. In the Appendix
20 A, a designation 1, 2 or 3 priority is detailed on the maps.
21 And there's also been made recommendations on the
22 preservation of historic character.

23 An example of historic preservation is a challenge
24 to come up with rock to rebuild retaining walls and guard
25 walls. When the road was originally built, most of the rock

1 came from the area that they actually made the cuts in. It
2 makes the most sense to use the native rock that's in the
3 Park. What has been found is that you probably can get most
4 of the rock within the Park by doing your rock scaling, and
5 there's areas that need to be scaled for rock fall,
6 utilizing the rock that comes from that as part of that area
7 for rebuilding the guard walls and retaining walls. If you
8 don't have enough, the idea there is to use the best rock
9 where it's most visual, and on the other areas use rock of
10 lesser quality.

11 In these planning documents, the charge was not
12 necessarily to do an environmental assessment of how
13 different alternatives would be addressed. But this team
14 knows that when you go through the Environmental Impact
15 Statement, that's something that's going to need to be
16 addressed in great detail. And so during this process, the
17 people worked on the road in the field to make sure that the
18 team wasn't recommending anything that was going to
19 necessarily be tossed immediately out of an environmental
20 impact process.

21 Preservation of natural resources is a field that
22 the team has addressed in a few areas. And one of them is
23 in the rock itself. There's rock on the road that came from
24 Minnesota. In fact, it was a former company, Morrison
25 Knudsen, that brought in the granite from Minnesota.

1 Develop a cultural framework for rehabilitation.

2 It was mentioned that one of the things that should be done
3 with the rock scaling is to do that in the fall. It's the
4 safest time to do it; you have the lowest number of
5 visitors. And if the rock scaling can be done and make
6 small collections of the rock that are pulled off and also
7 there's a lot of rock on the slopes that have fallen down
8 the side, pull that aside, set it up in caches, perhaps in
9 pullouts. What they're actually doing is doing it like they
10 did when they built the road. They were building pullouts
11 in order to stage their equipment. And, in essence, this
12 team is recommending the same kind of thing in order to
13 construct the project. So when you come back in the
14 springtime you've got your cache of rock and you can start
15 building pretty much immediately.

16 Another thing that needs to be faced in the resort
17 business is to do all the work, get it done within a
18 reasonable cost, and get it done as quickly as you can and
19 don't impact any visitors. So being challenged with that as
20 well, the team has come up with some ways that can be done.

21 Joe is not here to say there will not be any
22 impact during the rehabilitation. There will be impact.
23 And the recommendations include using mitigation strategies,
24 providing choices, providing alternatives for visitors to
25 the Park, other than specific areas on the road.

1 Provide a world class visitor experience, i.e.,
2 Folks, this is the most beautiful road in America to drive.
3 The impact during the rehabilitation must be minimized in
4 order to keep the visitors here. Joe thinks this team has
5 come up with some good strategies to minimize that, but
6 reminds everyone there will be impact.

7 Provide new opportunities for visitors.
8 Recommendations have been made, specifically in the
9 transportation visitor use studies, that could make a
10 difference in the rehabilitation efforts in terms of
11 visitors, giving them more of an alternative rather than
12 just driving the road. Driving the road is the primary
13 reason people come to the Park; that is the experience they
14 see. In addition to that, the team can give them other
15 ideas.

16 One of the ideas talked about quite extensively
17 was providing an information system on what you could do and
18 get that to the people. It can be posted on web sites, it
19 can be in kiosks. The key is real-time information. And
20 what has been found in this line of work is that if people
21 have the information and it's real, you're good with the
22 public. If you say the road's going to be closed at this
23 particular time for 20 minutes and it's not closed, you're
24 going to lose your credibility with that. It's important to
25 give them real information that they can count on. So it's

1 important to give real-time accurate information, whatever
2 that is. And most visitors can deal with that.

3 Collaborate with others in exploring options that
4 stimulate local and regional economic growth. The team has
5 recommended some good visitor use opportunities and
6 transportation alternatives in this rehabilitation that
7 could be developed as part of the rehabilitation effort and
8 possibly continued afterwards.

9 As the engineers, the team was charged with
10 developing some rehabilitation alternatives. There are
11 engineering criteria standards, design criteria, historic
12 preservation, different construction techniques, different
13 material types, long-term maintenance, traffic, visitor
14 management, and risk management. If all of those criteria
15 are looked at, along with the well over 200 sites, there's a
16 matrix of possibly 2000 different alternatives that could be
17 recommended for moving forward. The team tried to make that
18 a little bit easier by doing a process. This is the
19 difficult part.

20 The team has not recommended any restoration
21 techniques; they have recommended preservation and
22 rehabilitation. So when the team looked at a particular
23 site, it provided basic historic preservation or
24 rehabilitation, if it was a historic structure. And it was
25 the consultant in that area that told the team what was

1 significant and what was not significant.

2 For those areas that are not historic, the team
3 would rehabilitate in a manner that was similar to the
4 original historic.

5 In terms of traffic management, it's a range of
6 least impact to most impact. (For the alternatives that
7 were carried through for each individual site, refer to
8 Appendix A). The team recommended a moderate visitor
9 impact. And there can be a long discussion on what's
10 moderate, what's least, what's most. But the tools chosen
11 were a moderate visitor impact to carry through.

12 In terms of engineering, there's the long life
13 cycle, the prudent life cycle, the shortest life cycle, and
14 the shortest provides you the lowest. What the team has
15 done is in the alternative, the recommendation for each
16 individual site, they have recommended a prudent life cycle
17 with a low to moderate option and maintenance cost.

18 Whereupon, questions were fielded.

19 MR. JACKSON: What's a life cycle?

20 MR. KRACUM: That's how long the structure
21 would last. Is it 20 years, is it 50 years before you have
22 to go in and rehabilitate or reconstruct or restore all
23 together? That's the life cycle.

24 MR. JEWETT: How many years is prudent versus
25 long, versus short?

1 MR. KRACUM: Each individual element is
2 different. Prudent life cycle, pavement types, might be
3 seven years. A long life cycle might be 20 years. For a
4 bridge, the prudent life cycle would be 20 years, a long
5 would be 50 years. So for each individual element, they had
6 to make judgments for each individual site to say which was
7 which.

8 MR. JEWETT: So the standard you chose for
9 your preferred alternative was a prudent life cycle for all.
10 That was across the board?

11 MR. KRACUM: Yes.

12 MR. DAKIN: Could I ask a question about the
13 cultural historic categories opportunities on this page?
14 And I'm struggling with some of that because it seemed to me
15 that there was some incongruity between the cultural
16 landscape report versus the engineering report, in terms of
17 what might be done with a particular station on the road.
18 And I thought that there was parts of the landscape report
19 that seemed to be directing us toward a restoration
20 standard.

21 So I guess my question, after reading all that
22 material, and it was kind of overwhelming, pretty
23 impressive, at what era do you determine that something was
24 historic? I mean, are we talking about the 1930s, the
25 1950s, after the road was paved, the time that the road was

1 designated on the Register? I mean, I'm really fuzzed out
2 on that. I'm going to need some guidance.

3 MR. KRACUM: And this is going to be my first
4 opportunity -- I'm going to ask Mark to explain that.

5 MR. BANCALE: I'd be happy to give it a shot.

6 I'll talk for just a couple of extremely quick
7 minutes as to what we did as part of the cultural landscape
8 inventory and study. The study was conducted somewhat
9 independently of the products prepared by Washington
10 Infrastructure, although in conjunction with them. And it
11 included two components; a cultural landscape inventory,
12 which was completed last fall and winter, which included a
13 complete mapping of all of the historic and nonhistoric
14 engineering features on the road, all the guard walls, all
15 the retaining walls, all the bridges, all the culverts, so
16 on and so on. For each of those engineering features, each
17 of those objects or structures, the team determined whether
18 they were historic, what their level of historic integrity
19 was, and whether they would contribute or not contribute to
20 a hypothetical National Register nomination for the area
21 that they were in.

22 And that resulted in a book of about 150 maps and
23 another 150 pages of notes that provides information on each
24 individual engineering feature on the road.

25 The team has prepared, in draft form, a cultural

1 landscape report, which is the big thick document that all
2 of the Committee members have seen in draft form. It
3 provides a comprehensive history of the road and information
4 on potential recommendations for treatment of contributing
5 and historic features from the standpoint of a historian.

6 As part of the engineering team that MK -- or
7 Washington had in the field last summer, and I talked with
8 them constantly throughout the process about appropriate
9 historic treatments to historic features on the road -- and
10 just about every time we ended up with some kind of
11 consensus. There are a few cases where I just kind of dug
12 in my heels and said No, this concrete wall is just too
13 ugly, it's got to go, and the engineer said No, it would
14 just cost too much money, it would be too horrific a job to
15 take out a concrete wall and replace it with the
16 reconstructed native stone wall. So there are spots where
17 I'll recommend something based on my expertise as a
18 historian, the engineers will recommend something else based
19 on their expertise as engineers, and it will be the duty of
20 people who prepare the construction documents that yes,
21 there are other site specifics farther down the road, to
22 take those two conflicting recommendations and reconcile
23 them into something that basically makes everyone as happy
24 as possible; something that complies with historic
25 preservation law and is still feasible from an engineering

1 perspective.

2 MS. TRIBE: Bill, does that answer your
3 question about at what historic point in time?

4 MR. DAKIN: It really answered my questions
5 about why the historical documents and engineering reports
6 don't exactly mesh, beautiful. No, I still don't quite know
7 if we're talking '30s or '50s. You're always preserving the
8 history that you like and getting rid of the ones you don't.

9 MR. BANCALE: The established period of
10 significance that is in the current National Register
11 documentation for the road, which states the period of
12 significance extends to, I believe, 1952. It's my personal
13 opinion that almost all, if not all, the significant
14 historic features on the road are older than the Second
15 World War. It was done by the mid to late '30s, pretty much
16 everything.

17 MS. PAHL: Is the confusion lack of agreement
18 around whether or not you will reconstruct or restore the
19 historic wall where it doesn't exist as opposed to where it
20 does exist that everybody's agreed to restore it?

21 MR. BANCALE: Well, I can't answer that in
22 less than half an hour of discussion time. But essentially,
23 there are spots where there is not historic wall, where the
24 engineers and the historian agree that it would be
25 appropriate to reconstruct a stone wall in that place.

1 There are other spots where that isn't perhaps a viable
2 option because of avalanche hazards or other economic
3 factors or any of a whole bunch of things.

4 MS. PAHL: What I'm getting to is, my first
5 priority would be to save -- and there's national parks that
6 are standards that define those things, restoration centers,
7 rehab standards, reconstruction standards. But I guess my
8 bottom line would be that where we have original material
9 left, and I think most of it is from the '20s and '30s, that
10 that be preserved as much as possible, restored as much as
11 possible. And secondary to that would be whether or not
12 there's money in the budget, or if it's a good idea, for
13 safety and other aspects, to replace.

14 MR. BANCALE: I absolutely agree with that
15 statement. I'll add two other very quick points to that.
16 One is that there will be issues in the future about if the
17 historic walls in place now are considered to have
18 appropriate crash worthiness, from an engineering
19 perspective. And that's an issue that's going to be
20 extremely important to resolve, prior to doing any
21 substantial rehabilitation work up there.

22 Current historic walls are not considered crash
23 worthy, in general, by FHWA. And if FHWA guidelines were to
24 be wholeheartedly employed up there, all the surviving
25 historic walls would probably either be removed or

1 reconstructed in different appearance. So that's one issue
2 that will have to be dealt with.

3 The other issue that involves historic walls is
4 that over the years, historic walls have been altered
5 through what has sometimes been inappropriate construction
6 techniques in the recent past, and so there's no black and
7 white as to what is an historic wall up there anymore. This
8 is especially true on the alpine sections of the road.
9 There are areas that retain a lot of historic fabric, and
10 then there's kind of this downward spiral to where there are
11 walls that have no historic fabric. And the question is
12 where do you cut the line off? There's a very broad
13 spectrum of gray shade there.

14 MR. KRACUM: One of the other pieces and
15 Mark's alluded to a couple of them, is where the walls got
16 knocked out by avalanche. Restoring a wall in the avalanche
17 area exactly how they did it in the '20s and '30s, in a year
18 or two could get knocked out again. So what we have done is
19 use a similar design to the FHWA to an avalanche resistant
20 where we actually have a concrete core and a structure that
21 you can't see, but it's covered with stone in a pattern that
22 replicates, as best you can, that fabric around the guard
23 walls.

24 --o0o--

25 Mr. Kracum continues and explains in the report

1 and in the rest of the discussion there will be traffic
2 control terms being used by which he wants to make sure
3 everybody understands.

4 Alternating one-ways is explained as a partitioned
5 area off of one lane of the roadway, exactly what is up on
6 the Going-to-the-Sun-Road now on the construction where you
7 basically have either a flagger or a traffic light at either
8 end and you have visitors continuing to move in alternating
9 directions around the construction without actually going
10 through the construction site. The delay is around five
11 minutes or less because all you're waiting for is the
12 traffic queues to pass, the traffic to pass one another. 70
13 percent or so of the recommended alternatives for each of
14 the sites can be done that way.

15 In places where materials and equipment must be
16 moved into and out of that construction site, the same
17 alternating one-ways are set up but flaggers are added to
18 allow the construction traffic to move in and out. And so
19 what is done is instead of allowing that continuous flow in
20 one direction then stop it, the other direction then stop
21 it; there's a period of time where both directions are
22 stopped at one time and allow the construction to happen,
23 the traffic to move either in or out or do some work on the
24 road that's going to require more than just that one lane.
25 About 20 percent of the work needs to be done in that

1 regard. And these are the types of traffic control methods
2 for that list in Appendix A of those more than 200 sites
3 that have been investigated in those recommendations.

4 Less than 10 percent of the work is going to
5 require the traffic to be stopped in both directions,
6 somewhere between 30 minutes and four hours. For example,
7 rock scaling. You cannot have an alternating one-way, you
8 cannot have the traveling public traveling under the area
9 where they're pulling rocks down. And so the idea is that
10 when you stop them, the people can climb up or get to where
11 they're going, start barring down, that gives them time to
12 get the material off; material's on the road now, got to
13 clean it up for the next traffic queue to move. Estimations
14 range from somewhere between 30 minutes and four hours. And
15 that's a range, but there's 235 sites altogether.

16 There are some areas where closures will be
17 greater than four hours. But it's a very small percentage.
18 And as you will see further on in the report is that those
19 areas that require a full closure, and that's for major rock
20 scaling or major road where the whole road template must be
21 removed, there are no choices. A segment of the road has to
22 be closed for approximately a thousand feet for two days,
23 about 2 percent of the work will be done then. It's
24 suggested to do that during the lowest visitor impact;
25 perhaps September and October and into November. It's too

1 difficult doing it at the front end of the season; May.

2 The team has developed four general rehabilitation
3 alternatives. Each one will be addressed.

4 One alternative is when something happens, you go
5 out and fix it. Don't do any prior planning, don't do any
6 prior design, don't do any prior traffic control management,
7 don't do any kind of visitor management beforehand. Using
8 2 million dollars a year of funding that that's going to
9 take, (at 2001 dollars) it will cost approximately 98 to 117
10 million dollars, roughly, over a 50-year time span.
11 Factoring in a 3 percent escalation factor per year, the
12 project could cost upwards of 300 million dollars.

13 The second alternative is what is called priority
14 rehabilitations, similar to what is being done now with FHWA
15 design. Currently using the traffic control guidelines
16 which limit visitors' delays to 15 minutes and at each of
17 the construction sites with a limitation of two sites going
18 on at one time, one on either side of the pass. Two hours
19 of delays are allowed at nighttime, three days a week plus
20 two Friday afternoons in October. So that gives a basic
21 traffic control. That's what's being used now.

22 In the report in Appendix C, there is a list of
23 the hours of the day that these alternatives would be
24 working. Basically two shifts; one that starts early in the
25 morning and stops somewhere before the lunch hour, one that

1 starts later in the afternoon, like 2:00 or 3:00 in the
2 afternoon and goes to eight, nine o'clock in the evening.
3 Each shift would be a 12-hour shift. No scheduling is
4 allowed for overtime. There has not been accounted for any
5 overtime dollars.

6 This second alternative is basically a 5 million
7 dollar per year funding scenario. The project ends up in
8 the 90 to 107 million dollar range. And if you escalate
9 that at the 3 percent factor, the range becomes between 128
10 and 154 million. The difference between the two
11 alternatives is alternative two, planning and design work is
12 done ahead of time. You put the designs on the shelf until
13 you have the construction funding to do the work. So you
14 get ahead of it.

15 In Joe's experience, especially with both state
16 and federally-funded projects, sometimes there's money left
17 over at the end of the fiscal year. The projects that
18 generally, in his experience, get that extra or this
19 discretionary funding are the projects that are ready to
20 contract. You have a better chance to get the discretionary
21 funding at the end of the year if you're going to build
22 something rather than doing a study, some planning or
23 design. So this alternative two gives you that opportunity.
24 Put that money up front, get those designs made which you
25 are doing with Federal Highway Administration right now on

1 the critical retaining walls.

2 The third alternative is called a comprehensive
3 shared use. It's where everybody gets a piece of the road
4 at some point. And basically what we're looking at is
5 during the week, between 10:00 and 2:00, most of the work
6 will be done with alternating one-ways. So you should have
7 less than a five-minute delay. During the weekends, same
8 kind of thing. Same thing on the holidays. So basically a
9 five-minute delay through most of the season.

10 The Park Service has provided the engineers with
11 visitor information, to allow scheduling the rehabilitation
12 construction around the minimal areas of visitor use. And
13 what has been found is that, basically between 7:00 in the
14 morning and later in the afternoon, it's a lot lower than
15 that peak time between 10:00 and 2:00 or 3:00 in the
16 afternoon. So doing a share with the contractor that's
17 going to do the work, you can get 30-minute delays during
18 that period. And if anything needs to be done in terms of
19 closures or extended two-way stops, that is done basically
20 between 7:00 at night and 7:00 in the morning when there's
21 the least amount of visitor impact.

22 Not all the work can be done at night. Rock
23 scaling can't be done at night. That's just unsafe for the
24 people who are doing it. It's unsafe for the Park personnel
25 that will be there as well. So there's some areas that

1 cannot be done at night.

2 In this particular plan, there are about four
3 weeks every fall in which portions of the road will be
4 closed each year for the rock fall or the rock scaling kind
5 of stuff, those high-risk safety issues. It also is much
6 better, from a safety standpoint, because in the springtime
7 you're still getting that freeze/thaw, all that moisture.
8 It's not real healthy for the guys that are hanging on the
9 ropes with scaling bars to be up there when that freeze/thaw
10 action is still going on.

11 With that third scenario, in today's dollars,
12 roughly 81 to 98 million dollars provide a rehabilitation of
13 eight to nine years. Escalated at 3 percent the range
14 becomes 98 to 118 million dollars.

15 As far as the working days required in the road
16 closure, that 20-day period is something that can be
17 scheduled in the design process. The projects are put
18 together so that you can plan ahead of times which days you
19 would close the road. In the fall, it makes sense to do
20 those during the week because your visitors come on the
21 weekends, primarily. So try to get those done during the
22 middle of the week. Try not to do too much on the weekends.
23 You're still going to have some work going on, but the
24 scenarios that are being given take into account that you've
25 got visitors coming through the Park at different times of

1 the day and different times of the week as well as different
2 times of the season. So schedule that work in the fall.
3 And that may be two or three days, or something else. In
4 general, construction cost or construction duration will be
5 the lowest for the most amount of time you can close the
6 road.

7 The fourth alternative extends the rehabilitation
8 season by doing two things. One is it limits the visitors
9 on the road between July 1 and October 1. That means prior
10 to July 1 some years you're going to get a week, some years
11 two weeks, may be lucky and get three weeks in some years.
12 It's all going to depend on the snow. The snow is what
13 controls the opening of the road.

14 It has been thought deeply about trying to add
15 more equipment, get the contractor to go up there and help
16 remove snow. There are avalanche considerations, especially
17 in the springtime. And in order to do that, you could spend
18 a lot of money trying to get a season working in May and
19 June that you'll just spend more than the value that you get
20 out of it. So allow the visitors to come in July 1st and
21 get what can be gotten at that front end. You're not going
22 to know until April what you can really get in.

23 From there, it basically has the same type of
24 traffic management as does the comprehensive use. There is
25 some money factored in for weather considerations, and

1 that's why there's some differences in the cost. But the
2 rehabilitation cost will be in a range of 90 to 108 million
3 dollars and it does shorten by about a year the
4 comprehensive shared use.

5 MR. BLACK: Are we talking about only two
6 spots on the road, one on each side on both of these, or are
7 you talking about several?

8 MR. KRACUM: For the comprehensive shared
9 use, the extended rehabilitation season and for the road
10 segment closures, I'm talking about an entirely new traffic
11 control plan, brand new, not limiting one side or the other.

12 MR. BLACK: My question is when you're saying
13 a 30-minute delay, could it be a 30-minute delay at four
14 subsequent spots which end up being a two-hour delay going
15 through the Park?

16 MR. KRACUM: Well, when we heard of
17 Interstate 70 through Glenwood Canyon, they didn't specify
18 whether the 30 minutes was for each individual site or for
19 the whole time. And we worked a whole year dealing with the
20 contractors who figured it out real quick, three contractors
21 on the job. And they figured oh, they could just time it
22 just right so that they could get the most amount of work
23 done, but the visitors were delayed 90 minutes. So right up
24 front I would say it's 30 minutes on your trip delay.

25 MR. O'QUINN: In our earlier discussions, we

1 had agreed that we would have two sites with maximum working
2 that we would have delays on at any time and the parameters
3 we were putting in. If you were talking 30 minutes, you
4 could conceivably be caught an hour. I thought that was the
5 way we discussed this.

6 MR. KRACUM: I don't see how you can do just
7 two sites on this road and get it done.

8 MR. O'QUINN: I'm talking about what would
9 have potential delays.

10 MR. KRACUM: Most every site will need some
11 delay, will have some management. When we looked at it, we
12 thought before we came up there would be some others where
13 we could not delay traffic at all. Pretty minimal areas
14 where there won't be a delay.

15 MR. JEWETT: This came out of the September
16 minutes last year. Consensus was reached and in
17 consideration of the following: Delays of 15 minutes per
18 construction site, one-half hour maximum delay per trip
19 across the road or a trip to the pass and return the same
20 way. Two-hour closures Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday,
21 between 8:00 and 10:00 p.m. is the first bullet. Second
22 bullet, which seems to be somewhat contradictory, one-hour
23 delay up to four 15-minutes each stop for a trip across the
24 Going-to-the-Sun Road or a trip to Logan Pass and return the
25 same way. So we adopted two separate standards, but the

1 least impact one is the one you're referring to.

2 MS. TRIBE: And, Joe, you tried to work
3 within those.

4 MR. KRACUM: Well, after spending time on the
5 road and seeing what has to be done, we made our best
6 recommendations. And that's not going to be an efficient
7 way to do it. I don't think you could do it in the time
8 frame you've just defined on that.

9 MS. TRIBE: But this group could, when they
10 recommend acceptable alternatives, come back with that
11 alternative.

12 MR. KRACUM: Absolutely. And we brought
13 people that do this on a daily basis. The people I brought
14 up here aren't planners. These are people that are
15 construction planners and who do this kind of work. And I'm
16 sorry, they can't work that way.

17 MS. PAHL: Didn't you just say the total
18 delay for your trip over, no matter how many sites, is 30
19 minutes? So how does that not meet the standard?

20 MR. KRACUM: It's a matter of interpretation.
21 But the idea is that even if we have 30 sites working at one
22 time -- say we had 10 sites to manage. The idea is to have
23 that traffic control coordinated through each of those sites
24 so that if a person were to travel from point A to point B,
25 west to east or east to west, at some point they don't get

1 any delay along the way. They're flowing right with the
2 traffic. And that's part of that information system I was
3 talking about earlier. Because that can be tied and
4 integrated with each of the individual sites by coordinating
5 individual traffic control within each of those sites. It's
6 tough. It's a tough thing to do to try to make it work.

7 MR. O'QUINN: That's real tough. You can put
8 it on paper, but it doesn't happen on the road.

9 MR. KRACUM: We've done it with about four
10 major contracts at one time. It's being done with about
11 four or five, but it's very difficult and is costly.
12 There's a lot of management, a lot of people on radios to
13 make it work. It has been suggested that it try to be done
14 electronically to minimize the delay and lower the costs.

15 MS. TRIBE: So Joe, you worked as hard as you
16 could to work within those bullets that Tony read. And
17 again, as this group looks at alternatives, they may come
18 back with another one that gets analyzed in the
19 environmental document that has huge costs or whatever. But
20 you're just saying to the group, you worked as hard as you
21 could within those.

22 MS. LEWIS: I wanted to ask a question about
23 the use of the word "closure." Are you using the word
24 "closure" to mean a two-way stop?

25 MR. KRACUM: No.

1 MS. LEWIS: One of the things that --

2 MR. KRACUM: A two-way stop is basically 30
3 minutes to four hours. And a closure is for more than 4
4 hours. It's for a particular portion of the road. I'm not
5 suggesting that you close the entire road.

6 MS. LEWIS: This is for -- I apologize for
7 not being very smart. In my little mind, you have two-way
8 stops that are defined in length of 30 minutes to four
9 hours, or you have two-way stops that are longer than four
10 hours and you're calling those a closure.

11 MR. KRACUM: Yes.

12 MS. PAHL: Don't do that.

13 MS. LEWIS: I think that's important in our
14 minds. When you say "closure," I'm trying to -- it's time,
15 it's not place. It's not it's closed from the west entrance
16 station to the east entrance station. That for four hours I
17 cannot travel completely west to east or east to west, but I
18 might be able to travel a certain distance west or a certain
19 distance east before I would be stopped --

20 MR. KRACUM: Right.

21 MS. LEWIS: -- and I couldn't proceed. So
22 it's a stop.

23 MS. PAHL: I think the reason you're bringing
24 this up is the first thing we talked a lot about that a big
25 part of this would be the public education awareness

1 campaign. And if the word "closure" is used, people will
2 perceive that the road is closed, therefore, the Park is
3 closed, and all these bad things will happen. So I think we
4 did say -- Tony's probably got the minutes over there -- to
5 find that dialogue somewhere that we weren't going to use
6 that word "closure"; that gave the wrong impression.

7 MS. TRIBE: And, Barbara, those are the
8 things we'll talk about in mitigation measures.

9 So Suzann, we were asking for a definition of
10 closure.

11 MR. O'QUINN: Before you get up to that, are
12 you saying -- a two-way stop, to me, is a situation where
13 you mean both lanes of traffic, so you can't be maintaining
14 one-way traffic.

15 MR. KRACUM: That's right.

16 MR. O'QUINN: So you're stopping traffic in
17 both directions. And you're calling that a two-way stop up
18 to four hours?

19 MR. KRACUM: And remember that it's within
20 the time frames that we're talking about. If you're in that
21 10:00 to 2:00 -- 10:00 in the morning 'til --

22 MR. O'QUINN: I can't imagine putting traffic
23 on the road and telling them they're going to come to a
24 point that they can't proceed for four hours.

25 MR. KRACUM: In the middle of the night is

1 when we'll do those things.

2 MR. O'QUINN: Well, do not use the word
3 "close," but the road is not passable. A two-way stop is
4 maybe 10 minutes, 30 minutes, absolute maximum. But you
5 can't put people on a highway and them think they're going
6 from one end of it to the other and encounter a place in
7 there that they're going to be stopped for three or four
8 hours, not when there's no alternative. That's just not
9 doable.

10 MS. TRIBE: Remember, again, the purpose of
11 this part of the agenda is to hear the contractors explain
12 the alternatives to us. And so I'm going to see if we can
13 kind of concentrate on the clarifying questions so we fully
14 understand, and then, Barney, when we get to evaluating the
15 alternatives tomorrow, that's exactly the kind of things
16 we're going to have to build in. Randy is next.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Joe, what I was wondering
18 about is Tony was reading from the minutes where we
19 recommended delays of no more than 15 minutes per site, no
20 more than 30 minutes for a trip across.

21 MR. KRACUM: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Is there an outside limit
23 that might help us with regard to this extended
24 rehabilitation season in the categories, five-minute delays
25 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.? Is there an outside limit on the

1 total amount of time that they might be stopped in those two
2 categories.

3 MR. KRACUM: For this particular alternative?

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah.

5 MR. KRACUM: Between 10:00 and 2:00, we want
6 to limit five minutes minimal delays; 7:00 'til 10:00 in the
7 morning and in the afternoon at 7:00 at night, we could have
8 30-minute delays.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: No. How many five-minute
10 delays are they entitled to? Can they get up to an hour's
11 worth of five-minute delays, or might it be limited to 30
12 minutes of 5-minute delays? Is it consistent with what we
13 have?

14 MR. KRACUM: It's consistent with what you
15 have.

16 MS. TRIBE: So you're saying the cumulative
17 falls within the guidelines they laid out.

18 MR. KRACUM: And the overall cumulative of
19 the entire rehabilitation process are these percentages
20 roughly right here. Like I say, almost three-quarters of
21 the work can be done with an alternating runway; 90 percent
22 of it can be done with ten-minute intermittent stops.

23 MR. BLACK: My confusion comes in where you
24 say there will be a 30-minute minimum delay, and then the
25 next one you say it's delays of four hours or less.

1 MR. KRACUM: Greater than four hours.

2 MR. BLACK: It says four hours or less on the
3 sheet here.

4 I guess, is it a minimum 30-minute delay or is it
5 a maximum 30-minute delay?

6 MR. KRACUM: Each individual site and each
7 individual operation will require different times to do that
8 work. So what is being given are some general guidelines
9 and general pieces that most of the work can fit into. For
10 me to say right now that at milepost 15.5 or whatever that
11 it's going to take 30-minute delays for six days, I don't
12 know; I have no idea. I could tell you what needs to be
13 done there. I can tell you how the traffic controls can be
14 done. I can tell you, roughly, how much delay there will be
15 in that. But until you go in there and do subsurface
16 investigations, the drilling, you assess the hydraulics to
17 know what kind of additional drainage you've got to do
18 there, and you do this in your design phase of the project,
19 that's where those pieces come out. These would be the
20 kinds of things that we could give those designers to work
21 within your guidelines. You take this and maybe you massage
22 this a bit and send that as a recommendation to the Park
23 Service so that becomes the traffic management guidelines.

24 MS. TRIBE: And this is one alternative.
25 Remember, we're not fighting Joe on that. We're looking at

1 all of these alternatives.

2 MR. KRACUM: These concepts are included in
3 all the alternatives.

4 MS. TRIBE: Can we go ahead?

5 Bill, will you make the last comment.

6 MR. DAKIN: Probably a minor question. I'm
7 sure you've put a great deal of thought to the time frames.

8 You essentially are offering the public an
9 unimpeded four hours in the middle of the day, July, August
10 and September.

11 MR. KRACUM: Essentially unimpeded, yes.

12 MR. DAKIN: Could you make it five? How did
13 you decide that it would be 2:00 to 7:00 rather than 3:00 to
14 8:00? That hour could be really a big thing, considering
15 that people will probably try to --

16 MR. KRACUM: We did put some thought into it.
17 There's a lot of ways to schedule construction. Typically,
18 it's a three-shift operation, 7:00 to 3:00, 3:00 to 11:00
19 and 11:00 to 7:00; day, swing, graveyard. I don't think you
20 have that opportunity here. One is, I don't think you have
21 enough work to do in the middle of the night to make a good
22 graveyard shift. The idea was to try to come up with two
23 shifts in a given day that could get a good balance of
24 daylight. When it's dark, it costs money to light it,
25 additional safety, production's a lot lower when it's dark.

1 So the idea was to try to come up with two shifts, mostly
2 with daylight in them, but with a little bit of dark time in
3 them. So if you start the first shift at 5:00 in the
4 morning, they can work up until 10:00 or 11:00, they get
5 their full shift in. It was Tony who brought it up. You
6 don't want to build overtime into your contracts. So you
7 try to design it so you can get a good 40-hour shift a week
8 for your work force. Minimizing the nighttime is the other
9 piece in that. So what we tried to do is give two shifts
10 that had a good amount of light and some dark by doing them
11 on opposite sides of this 10:00 to 2:00 period. So say
12 whether there's exactly 10:00 to 2:00 or 10:00 to 3:00, I
13 think that's a piece you could all come up with. But the
14 parameters we tried to use were a balance between work
15 productivity, safety and the visitor use. That might be
16 10:00 to 3:00; that might be 11:00 to 4:00. From the data
17 that we had, 10:00 to 2:00 made most sense.

18 MR. DAKIN: We do have real late daylight
19 hours in the summer.

20 MR. KRACUM: And you could make that a 3:00
21 to 11:00 shift. Again, I have to emphasize each individual
22 site's going to be a little bit different from one another.
23 Until you know the detailed pieces of what goes into that in
24 the design, that's the only time you're going to be able to
25 specify.

1 MS. MOE: I was just wondering, on the
2 comprehensive shared use, you had 20 days requiring
3 restoration between September and October. In the extended
4 rehabilitation, you're closed from October 1st, but you also
5 say there's ten days in September you would be closed. My
6 question is, how many days does the extended rehabilitation
7 scenario give you in the fall?

8 MR. KRACUM: Well, overall, I'd rather not
9 answer that directly. The difference between the two is
10 about a year's worth of difference in the rehabilitation by
11 doing it that way. By extending the seasons by closing the
12 road on October 1, you get an unimpeded traffic, you get
13 unimpeded work during October.

14 MS. MOE: But are you really closing
15 September 15th? Because from September 15th until October
16 1st is also closed. Is that your ten-day period?

17 MR. KRACUM: It could be. Again, it's the
18 individual sites that are going to have to identify how you
19 do that. If you find that it works best if you have one day
20 a week, say, every Wednesday it's closed during the fall,
21 maybe that's one way to do it. Maybe it's one week during
22 the fall or two weeks. That's how -- you need to settle in
23 when you do the design, and you guys give us the parameters
24 to make that design work.

25 MS. MOE: So I guess if we're considering the

1 extended rehabilitation, as an example, and we're looking at
2 this and we're only going to close it two days every two
3 weeks, you know, to make up your ten days or however you
4 want to do that, does that give you the same bang for your
5 buck, if you're saying you want ten days that are
6 consecutive? I mean, you're still getting ten days in
7 September. But if you're doing it every other day, that's
8 your ten days versus ten consecutive days.

9 MR. KRACUM: It depends on the year and it
10 depends on what site you're actually working on.

11 MR. BAKER: It's not cost effective doing it
12 that way, I don't think, pulling a day in the middle of the
13 week. When you can close it for an extended period of time,
14 then it becomes effective.

15 MR. KRACUM: Got it.

16 MS. TRIBE: So both of these folks are
17 asking, then, does it make more sense to have this bulk of
18 closure rather than days. But once again, remember what Joe
19 is doing. He's just presenting alternative ways of looking
20 at this. We're going to have plenty of time to analyze
21 this.

22 MR. KRACUM: Okay. And I'm going to show you
23 some of the comparisons as well.

24 --o0o--

25 The last alternative is where segments of the

1 road, portions, not the whole thing are closed. And that's
2 basically between 7:00 Sunday night and 10:00 Friday. Other
3 than closing the road from point A to point B, from east to
4 west, this is probably the fastest and least expensive way
5 to do the work; 72 to 84 million dollars. The idea is to
6 basically close the roads between Sunday night and Friday at
7 lunch, 10:00 a.m., in those areas. And it's a blow-and-go
8 operation. Get as much done as you possibly can during that
9 period of the week and open it to the weekends. In many
10 cases, it will still be alternating one-ways on the
11 weekends, but in many cases it will be possible to have a
12 free-flow during the weekends as well. It depends on the
13 specific sites.

14 At this point, it's hard to reduce any more time
15 and any more dollars off the cost of this project, short of
16 a full road closure. This report presents some numbers in
17 that regard, but that alternative was not considered a
18 viable alternative because of what has been considered in
19 the past.

20 Mr. Kracum then refers to another overhead view
21 that is contained in the report to the Committee which shows
22 the progression of the different alternatives, in terms of
23 constant dollars, escalated at 3 percent and roughly the
24 range, and a quasi objective comparison in duration costs,
25 operations. It shows that the road segment closures give

1 the lowest duration, lowest costs, lowest operations costs
2 and lowest maintenance costs, while the repair-as-needed
3 gives the highest of all of those. The pieces change within
4 the alternatives. That concludes Mr. Kracum's formal
5 presentation.

6 MR. JACKSON: How would you summarize these,
7 in terms of safety, both to the driving public and to the
8 construction workers?

9 MR. KRACUM: The first one is probably the
10 least safe, by far. The prior rehabilitations is a very
11 prudent alternative because you're looking now and trying to
12 make adjustments now. In terms of the other three, which
13 then become the diversion, safety wise, I would have to say
14 that if you don't have any traffic moving through a
15 construction zone, that's going to be the safest for the
16 traveling public and the Park Service personnel and the
17 employees of the contractor. But that -- it's rare when we
18 can actually close, you know, and give the contractor full
19 access to the roadway.

20 MS. LEWIS: The cost figures used throughout
21 the alternatives, do they include the costs for visitor
22 improvements and enhancements, such as pull-offs, and do
23 they include the cost that you may have anticipated that
24 would be associated with visitor transportation systems
25 during the construction?

1 MR. KRACUM: I'm glad you asked that
2 question, Suzann. No. The costs that are included in the
3 costs only include the rehabilitation cost. The
4 transportation visitor use study that was done is
5 essentially a menu of strategies or menu of options that you
6 can use to help mitigate that impact that you're going to
7 have by doing the rehabilitation.

8 Now, in general, the more impact you have to the
9 visitor, I would suggest the more alternatives you provide,
10 in terms of transportation and visitor use. The lesser the
11 impact, maybe the lesser those alternatives. So in overall
12 terms, greater impact, more visitor use alternatives, more
13 transportation alternatives.

14 MS. LEWIS: One quick follow-up. So if we go
15 to -- if this Committee, in the course of its deliberations
16 for the next three days, goes to the transportation visitor
17 use studies that I think we all have copies of, we should be
18 able to extrapolate from there any cost figures that could
19 be added to these cost figures so that this Committee
20 understands the full cost of implementing any -- or of the
21 recommendations that you might make.

22 MR. KRACUM: Basically. It's true for the
23 transportation alternatives. The visitor use is such a wide
24 range and such general pieces that we could give you an idea
25 during this meeting of the range of those costs. But no,

1 those particular costs are not included. But if you want
2 visitor strategy, we've got the right people here that can
3 make the calls and get those numbers.

4 MR. DAKIN: I understood you to say that the
5 3 percent escalated factor, which was probably best
6 case -- I mean, your experience over the last ten years is
7 more like 8 or 9 percent. And if construction started on --

8 MR. KRACUM: It depends on where it is, Bill.
9 In some places it's higher and in some places it's over.
10 The governor of Colorado had used 9 percent about three
11 years ago, is what he has experienced. Now what he's
12 included in that 9 percent, in some of your projects like
13 the Glenwood Springs Valley area, we're seeing around 5 or 6
14 percent per year. So it's a variable kind of thing.

15 MR. DAKIN: And even the constant cost, based
16 on this year's dollars, if this proceeded at lightening
17 speed, it might start in four or five years. So really,
18 these are absolute threshold figures. It's inevitable that
19 construction is going to cost more than these dollar
20 amounts.

21 MR. KRACUM: I think you've got a pretty good
22 range here, given the kind of alternatives and solutions
23 that have been presented. Yeah, construction
24 always -- things change, obviously. The benefit that we
25 don't have is strictly in the subsurface conditions of

1 what's down below that we can't see. That could be a
2 significant factor. Now, we have contingencies built in.
3 We used our best judgment on what those contingencies should
4 be. We give the best range with the information we have.
5 We feel comfortable about the numbers.

6 MR. O'QUINN: But basically, we've included
7 the barn.

8 MR. KRACUM: In the alternatives.

9 MR. O'QUINN: In the Alternative 5, the road
10 closure, are you comparing the General Management Plan that
11 the road be closed from Logan's Pass to the east or Logan's
12 Pass to the west so there's access on one side of the road,
13 or if the road is completely closed?

14 MR. KRACUM: I'm using, let's say, a mile
15 strip somewhere on the road. That's closed. It's not the
16 whole road or one side or the other, it's where the
17 rehabilitation needs to be done. And obviously, what we
18 would try to do is if you were to do something like that,
19 package this work in such a way so that you can get the most
20 bang for your buck during that period of time.

21 MS. KREMENIK: So potentially, the road could
22 be opened from the east side of the pass for one year or the
23 west side.

24 MR. KRACUM: You could do that. Because I
25 caution you, the sites are spread out.

1 MS. KREMENIK: I was trying to compare that
2 to one of the alternate plans.

3 MR. KRACUM: We have taken it that next step,
4 and I didn't make a big deal about it. Here's what it could
5 cost and roughly how much time it would take, if you did
6 close it from entrance to entrance.

7 MS. TRIBE: So bang for your buck includes
8 not just money but also use for the visitor. You're
9 including all of that.

10 MR. JEWETT: I'm confused on the extended
11 rehabilitation season cost. It's the only one where the
12 number of years in which where there are less years you take
13 to do it and the cost increases. Could you explain that?

14 MR. KRACUM: Why do you do that? We're
15 trying to get as much construction done in a given year.
16 And, you know, some effort could be placed prior to July 1
17 to remove some snow to get to the sites. In the conditions,
18 though, at the beginning of that season, you have avalanches
19 to contend with. So you've got more of an effort, in terms
20 of safety, that you've got to put in right up front. In the
21 end of the season, the late September, October, November
22 season, you may be clearing snow to finish work to get done.
23 You're going to have shorter construction days. It's going
24 to be colder. And we've put factors in there to say Okay;
25 if you're going to do this under adverse conditions, it's

1 going to cost you more. So what we're saying with that
2 particular alternative is Yes, we can cut a year off or so,
3 but you've got to put more money into it in order to do
4 that. Make sense?

5 MR. JEWETT: Yeah, it makes sense. It's
6 interesting. I'm curious that it would add that kind of
7 cost for those seasons. But I don't want to belabor that
8 point.

9 MR. KRACUM: At a break I will take you
10 through the appendix.

11 MR. JEWETT: I'm very excited about that,
12 Joe.

13 Realizing you came in somewhat in the middle of
14 the process, were you aware that actually one of the
15 consensus points of this Committee a year ago was that the
16 baseline alternative would, in fact, be what Jayne said,
17 which was closure of the road halfway up to Logan Pass
18 just -- and it was baseline so that we knew what that cost
19 would be? And that's not in here.

20 MR. KRACUM: We approached the project given
21 the constraints that we had placed on us but also with an
22 openness and a flexibility to try to do the best we could
23 possibly come up with the conditions that we encountered
24 with the experience that we had. So, you know, it's one of
25 those things, Tony, we're forced to work and think out of

1 the box, but sometimes we are most forced into working
2 within the rules of the box. So we like to fold those rules
3 out a little bit. Sometimes we have to fold them out in
4 order to get them out of the box. It's the best shots we've
5 got, under the circumstances.

6 MR. JEWETT: My point is, I think the
7 Committee was interested to see what the cost would be if
8 the -- for discussion purposes -- if the alternative
9 originally chosen was put in as an alternative so we could
10 see what that would be. And that was, I think, what Jayne
11 was talking about.

12 MS. TRIBE: Did you say a minute ago, Joe,
13 you could come up with those costs?

14 MR. KRACUM: Not in the next two minutes, I
15 can't. But we could -- yes, we could.

16 MR. JACKSON: One other thing that is -- has
17 always been is that there has been some major failure of the
18 road and like, apparently, was at risk a couple years ago at
19 Big Bend. And that would really create a bigger mess than
20 anybody has managed in any of these alternatives. And I
21 wonder how you would rank these, in terms of reducing the
22 risk of that kind of huge major failure.

23 MR. KRACUM: Probably from bottom to top,
24 least risk to most risk. That's my --

25 MR. JACKSON: So the priority rehab doesn't

1 come in second, in terms of reducing major risk.

2 MR. KRACUM: Arguably, it could. I mean, all
3 four of these, really, address the risk better than any of
4 the others; repair as needed, for instance. Catastrophic
5 failure, is what you're talking about, have major impacts on
6 everything. I mean, a lot of those you can see and a lot of
7 those you can't see. I can say, though, if you start
8 putting -- allocating, somehow, more dollars right now to
9 the maintenance and operations, you're going to have a less
10 likelihood of a catastrophic failure, get more attention on
11 it now.

12 MS. TRIBE: So, Dave, your question was which
13 one of these alternatives would reduce the risk of that
14 major failure the most.

15 MR. KRACUM: The priority rehabilitations.
16 All of these are done in terms of priority. All the
17 alternative sites would be done on a priority basis. You
18 only have five million dollars of funding here, so those are
19 the ones you work on right away. So that's why I say, the
20 faster you can get it done, the less likelihood of a
21 catastrophic failure would happen.

22 MS. PAHL: It seems like throughout your
23 reports, at times, you recommend while the EIS is going that
24 the Park Service and federal highways work on those priority
25 rehabilitations. I read that several times in here. So I

1 think that your point is made, in terms of how to not stop
2 that important work, hopefully, avoid that catastrophe.

3 I would also like to say this was so much better
4 than the first version of this report. I want to thank you
5 for whatever you did. It read more easily, the pieces fit
6 together, so I appreciate the changes you made between the
7 draft one and this one.

8 MR. KRACUM: Thank you.

9 MS. TRIBE: Well, maybe that's a good place
10 to have Brian's last comment.

11 MR. BAKER: I would assume that these cost
12 estimates are based at the point in time when the contract
13 is actually tendered for the road. Obviously, if we were
14 doing priority rehabilitations for the next four or five
15 years as was needed, there's going to be chunks dropping off
16 of that, as are mitigation measures for road closures,
17 et cetera, et cetera. It may well be that over the next
18 four years, if some of those key sites are fixed, we may not
19 have as long a closures as we thought.

20 MR. KRACUM: You're right. And you really
21 picked up on it. Because as each year progresses, you pull
22 that year off and escalate for the following year. So all
23 the numbers were actually done in 2001 dollars and then
24 escalated accordingly each year.

25 MR. BAKER: But based on the time the

1 contract was tendered.

2 MR. KRACUM: Based on when the contract would
3 actually start too. And those are in Appendix B of the
4 years that are done.

5 MS. TRIBE: So, Joe, I'm assuming you're
6 going to be around here for these days.

7 MR. KRACUM: I sure hope so. I don't want to
8 get on another airplane.

9 MS. TRIBE: This might be a good time to
10 acknowledge Joe's presentation. Thank you very much. And,
11 Barbara, thanks for your comments about the clarity of the
12 document.

13 What I'd like to do is give you about 15 minutes.
14 I see there are some treats over there and coffee and other
15 stuff, and that will also give Jean some time to get set up.
16 So I'd like to ask you if you would be responsible for being
17 back in your chairs at 15 minutes after 3:00.

18 (Proceedings in recess from 3:05 p.m. to
19 3:20 p.m.)

20 Suzann Lewis reminds the Committee members that in
21 their packet are the two previous meeting recommendations.

22 Suzann also introduces and welcomes the partners
23 that have been with the Committee throughout this whole
24 process; the Federal Highway Administration, consisting of
25 Dick Gatten, and Ron Carmichael, division engineer for the

1 Western Federal Lands Highway division in Vancouver,
2 Washington.

3 Jean Townsend is introduced. She works for
4 Coley/Forrest, Incorporated. Some of her presentation will
5 be beyond the Charter of this Committee. The meat of what
6 is necessary are the mitigations at the end of the
7 presentation, so Virginia asks that questions be held until
8 the mitigation part is gone through.

9 Ms. Townsend worked on the socioeconomic part of
10 the assignment, and she has benefited, and she thinks the
11 piece of work has improved because of the comments that were
12 given to the draft report.

13 The socioeconomic study consisted of the three
14 surveys: survey of visitors, potential visitors and
15 businesses. A handout contained in the Committee members'
16 packets contains the results of each survey conducted.

17 Jean will give a descriptive analysis of the base
18 work, but basically go over the visitor strategies and
19 actions, because that's the piece of the assignment that is
20 now being turned back to the Committee. And the team needs
21 the Committee's advice and recommendations on the visitor
22 strategies and recommendations.

23 The first survey done was a survey of visitors,
24 which was done August of 2000, a year ago. It was a
25 handout. The survey was handed out to visitors as they

1 entered the gate at both entrances of the gate and then were
2 asked to mail them back. Approximately 3,000 were
3 distributed with a 47-percent return. This survey excluded
4 Montanans and Canadians. These statistics focus on the
5 out-of-state visitor.

6 The visitor survey was of people who actually
7 visited the Park in August 2000. Highlights from that
8 visitor survey: Household income was very high. This is
9 not a surprise. 26 percent of the respondents had a
10 household income of a hundred thousand dollars or more.
11 Average in the country, about 12 percent of households have
12 an income of a hundred thousand or more. Nearly
13 three-quarters of the visitors have a college degree.
14 Average responding age was fifty, pretty similar to prior
15 work. Average travel party size, 2.8.

16 Reasons for conducting the visitor survey was to
17 get demographic characteristics, because it helps the team
18 to present marketing ideas. It's not just this passive
19 information. It's directly helpful to the team as they work
20 on the visitor development strategies.

21 On average, these visitors stay in the local area
22 four days. Their total expenditures per day, ranged between
23 \$228 a day and \$323 a day. So the truth is somewhere in
24 between. 57 percent had visited before. That was very
25 helpful in designing the media pitches within the visitor

1 development strategy, both focusing on folks who had been
2 here before and haven't. People plan an average of three
3 additional visits in the next three years. So whether this
4 is their first visit or not, these are repeat visitors.

5 Among these visitors, 9 out of 10 did go up
6 through Logan Pass. Some contingent behavior questions were
7 asked: If this is true, then how would you behave? If this
8 were true, then how would you behave? From this aspect of
9 the survey, it was learned that 25 percent of those surveyed
10 said if they heard there were travel restrictions on
11 Going-to-the-Sun Road, they might not make that visit.
12 Later in the survey they were given an alternative.
13 Going-to-the-Sun Road might be closed, but there's this
14 alternative and that alternative. Interestingly, when
15 provided with some alternative ideas, the number of people
16 that said they wouldn't come to the Park went down to 14
17 percent. That's very encouraging.

18 If the Park can provide other things for people to
19 do and other ways to entertain themselves, if there were any
20 sort of travel restrictions, then, indeed, the Park will get
21 more visitors. That theme was repeated in the next survey
22 presented.

23 Again, encouraging information. More specific, if
24 there were a one-hour restriction, that is if there were a
25 one-hour travel delay, would you do any of these things?

1 Would you take a sight-seeing bus? 45 percent said yes.
2 Would you just wait the one hour and drive your vehicle? 36
3 percent said that's what I would do. Would you come anyway
4 if you knew there was going to be a one-hour delay? Some
5 people said I'd come anyway, I just wouldn't use
6 Going-to-the-Sun Road. And only 8 percent said they
7 wouldn't come. This is a contingent behavior thing. If
8 they knew ahead of time there was going to be a one-hour
9 delay, as much as 8 percent said they would not visit the
10 Park.

11 MR. BLACK: For clarification, was there a
12 distention between taking a sight-seeing bus and not having
13 to wait the hour or waiting the hour and taking their car?

14 MS. TOWNSEND: It was A or B. If there were
15 a one-hour delay, what would you do? And 45 percent said I
16 wouldn't tolerate the one-hour delay, because we gave them
17 the option of getting on a bus and using the road.

18 MS. PAHL: Going over the road in a bus.

19 MR. BLACK: The bus is going to be delayed an
20 hour too, isn't it?

21 MS. TOWNSEND: Not under this, if we stopped
22 your vehicle but we gave you this bus alternative.

23 MS. PAHL: So it's not a sight-seeing tour to
24 some other spot.

25 MR. O'QUINN: How can the bus go through but

1 the car not?

2 MS. TOWNSEND: Maybe they walk around and go
3 through. It's hypothetical.

4 Using demographic questions that we asked, we
5 learned that the people that are least likely to come to the
6 Park, if we told them ahead of time to, tend to be those
7 that were actually shorter-term visitors in the first place.
8 They were only planning to come for a day, so they just
9 cancelled; people for whom visiting Glacier National Park
10 was just a side trip to them. They'd already come to visit
11 their relatives, and this was just a side trip or whatever.

12 MR. BAKER: Are we still excluding Montanans
13 and Canadians?

14 MS. TOWNSEND: No. Because the least likely
15 were also outside Montana. And also people that actually
16 spend more money were more likely be those that wouldn't
17 come. A bit of a discomfort perhaps. There was no
18 difference with respect to age at all. So this begins to
19 tell us who our target market is.

20 --o0o--

21 Ms. Townsend continues. The second survey was a
22 survey of potential visitors. This was a specific request
23 of the Advisory Committee. It was Will Brook that really
24 felt strongly that what we needed to do was go talk to the
25 folks that were thinking about coming to Glacier National

1 Park, and ask them some of these sort of contingent behavior
2 questions and see what they would say. And a potential
3 visitor is defined this way: They had inquired about coming
4 to Glacier National Park within the last 12 months, they
5 didn't come, and they intend to come. This type of survey
6 has never been done, to Jean's knowledge, in the country.
7 Clever folks you Committee members.

8 It took a long time to get permission to conduct
9 this survey, not from the good folks at Glacier National
10 Park, but back in DC. So after some begging and arguing of
11 the case, the survey was conducted in June of 2001. It took
12 six or seven months to get approval.

13 Ms. Lewis explains that the National Park Service
14 does not have the freedom to survey visitors without the
15 clearance and approval of the Office of Management and
16 Budget and the President's administration. It is not a
17 home-based decision. She thanks Jean for fighting the good
18 fight for in making that case to OMB. It was not easily
19 done.

20 Ms. Townsend explains this was a telephone survey.
21 The goal of surveying 350 people was exceeded by 4. Only 10
22 percent of the people that answered the phone refused to
23 participate in the survey. It speaks to the project. It
24 speaks to the National Park Service. The list of those to
25 be surveyed was purchased from Travel Montana, and all

1 surveyed were from out of the State of Montana.

2 After going through several filter questions
3 before they became an eligible person to be interviewed, 82
4 percent of them were qualified and surveyed.

5 Some demographics about those surveyed: Average
6 travel party size, 3.6, very consistent with other surveys
7 that have been done of visitors in the Park. Household
8 income now averaged about 13 percent earned a hundred
9 thousand dollars or more. Respondent age, fifty-one. 38
10 percent had made a prior visit to Glacier National Park.
11 Interestingly, 39 percent had never heard of
12 Going-to-the-Sun Road.

13 The Committee needs to be conscious of the fact
14 that almost 40 percent of potential visitors never heard of
15 the road. They plan to come but they never heard of the
16 road. And so to frighten them by talking about travel
17 restrictions about a road that never was in their mind is a
18 reason why they were coming, makes you pause and, again,
19 speaks to the team directly regarding the marketing effort.
20 So that information alone was a good reason to do this piece
21 of work.

22 But the most encouraging thing is really the
23 results to these questions. They were asked, Would you come
24 to the Park if travel were restricted on Going-to-the-Sun
25 Road? And 95 percent said Yes. Later in the survey, they

1 were asked a similar question, on purpose but apart, Would
2 you come if there were travel restrictions but we offered
3 travel alternatives? And 96 percent said Yes. Now these
4 questions are similar to the questions in the survey of
5 visitors. To tell you the truth, the first number was
6 expected to be lower than 95 percent, so the follow-up
7 question was asked. Though encouraging, five or six percent
8 is also a big number, if you have a business that's leaning
9 90 percent on tourism. So that's not to be understated.

10 Similar to the survey of visitors, they were asked
11 If road rehabilitation limits travel, would you: 52 percent
12 said they'd take a free tour bus; 36 percent said they would
13 pay to go over Going-to-the-Sun Road; 8 percent said they
14 would visit the Park and, in this case, only 4 percent said
15 they would not come. If there were 30-minute travel delay
16 would you still drive over the Park? 89 percent said Yes.
17 If there was an hour travel delay, would you still drive?
18 64 percent said yes. If there was a four-hour travel delay,
19 15 percent said they'd sort of hang out.

20 Moving along, the third survey, again, hadn't been
21 done before, so permission had to be granted. The
22 businesses were surveyed in Flathead, Lake and Glacier
23 Counties in Montana, along with a part of southwestern
24 Alberta. This was a mail out/mail back. It was delivered
25 to about 7,600 businesses, and a 20-percent response rate

1 was received from that. Jean was hoping for a 25-percent
2 return.

3 A few statistics about the businesses surveyed.
4 All businesses were surveyed. 87 percent are locally owned.
5 82 percent have only one location. Average years in
6 operation was 21 years. The team received some very good
7 information about the seasonal tourists, part-time and
8 full-time, that really can be helpful when the economic
9 impact analysis is done. Of all the businesses surveyed,
10 about 14 percent of their annual revenues are attributable
11 to visitors. And among those, 60 percent of those
12 visitor-related revenues occurred during the summer months.

13 The businesses were asked Do you anticipate a
14 negative impact due to road rehabilitation? 37 percent said
15 Yes. 61 percent said No, but keep in mind it was hospitals,
16 it was lawyers, farms and ranches. So 90 percent of the
17 lodging establishments were concerned. Also asked but not
18 shown in the survey was the question What kind of impact do
19 they anticipate due to the construction itself? And a lot
20 of people said they hoped to be positively affected.

21 Also asked was What impacts do you expect after
22 the road is built? 41 percent said they anticipated a
23 positive impact; 57 percent said neutral, nothing; and 2
24 percent said they anticipate a negative impact.

25 The fun part of the survey was the survey

1 purposely asked two open-ended questions. Most people don't
2 respond to open-ended questions. One of the questions was
3 Please tell us any sort of programs, activities, projects,
4 ideas, that you might have that would lessen the impact of
5 road rehabilitation on your business. Purposely open-ended
6 because the team wanted to generate as much creativity as
7 possible and, also, it was a test against the mitigation
8 strategies that the local economic development specialists
9 prepared. So 470 people took the time to write, and Dayna
10 Hudson has the raw result. They wrote all over the survey
11 sheet. And they were given lots of room. They went on and
12 on and on. They had a lot to say. And reading the raw
13 results is sort of fun because there's color in it. Jean is
14 giving the Committee a scientific summary that's far more
15 boring than the results.

16 The top ten, in order of priority, remarks that
17 were made: 1. Use the media. Send out a positive message.
18 The Park is open, the Park is open, the Park is accessible.
19 2. Market other areas within the Park, not focusing on the
20 road itself. 3. Work quickly/finish it fast. 4. Market
21 other areas outside the Park. 5. Leave a portion of the
22 road open. 6. Use the rehabilitation activity itself as a
23 visitor attraction. And they gave very detailed information
24 as to how they think that ought to be done. 7. Close one
25 side at a time. 8. Improve public transit. Some people

1 included the very bold statement of close the road to
2 vehicles and use public transit only. 9. Do the
3 construction activity at night. 10. Close one-half at a
4 time.

5 There were almost two open-ended questions. We
6 also said Are there any other comments you want to make?
7 That's broad. It was amazing how similar their other
8 comments were.

9 Again, going from the top ten remarks but in
10 order: Most of the remarks the top vote getter, if you
11 will, was 1. Make the improvements; they are needed. Some
12 version of that remark. If they put a time frame in it,
13 they said 2. Do it now. 3. Deliver positive "Park is open"
14 media message. 4. Short-term downturn/long-term gain.
15 Similarly, they said 5. Make the negative business impact
16 during rehabilitation. 6. Build quickly. 7. Honor historic
17 attributes of the road. And this is coming from the
18 business community filling out this form, all independently.
19 8. No impact to me. 9. Close the road/construct quickly.
20 10. Leave the road open during construction. Now, in the
21 supplemental report there's more answers. These are just
22 the top ten. The others are really interesting answers too.
23 Including there was simply a remark to the Park Service
24 thanking them for their efforts. Those are the three
25 surveys.

1 Also in the team report is a socioeconomic base
2 analysis. The intent of that report is to describe the
3 local economy as the baseline condition before any of these
4 road improvement alternatives that are being looked at. So
5 the analysis is done county by county, and some good
6 comments were received to sort of clean up, fix up that
7 report. It will probably be freshened up during the EIS
8 process, because some of the data is a little dated now.
9 The Committee has a copy of these handouts. This is summary
10 information from Flathead, Glacier and Lake Counties and the
11 southwest portion of Alberta, which for purposes of this
12 analysis, were three municipal districts. She will be happy
13 to answer questions regarding that overall forecast.

14 Some historic trends regarding visitor forecasts.
15 One of the responsibilities of the team was to prepare
16 baseline visitor forecasts into the future. Over the last
17 89 years, if you go back over the whole stream of time,
18 visitors have increased an average of 7.1 percent. Over the
19 last 50 years, 2.6 percent; just the last 27 years it has
20 remained flat; the last ten years, there has been an average
21 decrease of 1.4 percent. You can't learn too much from that
22 information. It's more unsettling than anything. Just sort
23 of for the Committee's information. And this whole subject
24 of visitor forecasts is far more difficult and more
25 challenging than Ms. Townsend anticipated.

1 It's so difficult that the National Park Service
2 has this wonderful group of social scientists in DC. They
3 prepared a document included in the report beginning on page
4 134 or 135. They haven't found a way to do this well. They
5 have done a piece, however, that looks at a whole bunch of
6 different types of demographic statistics, business
7 statistics, economic statistics, and then it discusses, kind
8 of in a qualitative way, how the change in age might affect
9 visitation; how gasoline prices might affect visitation.
10 It's a qualitative piece. It's interesting. But they
11 backed off of quantifying, i.e., If this is true, then this
12 is what the visitor number is, because they have deduced
13 they haven't figured out how to do it yet.

14 Visitation to the parks seems to fluctuate for a
15 variety of reasons, but they're unpredictable; energy
16 crisis, natural disasters, fires. You can look back,
17 retrospectively, and say Visitors weren't decreased or
18 increased because of X, Y and Z. But what we haven't found
19 are some factors which we can forecast into the future. You
20 can look back, but it's difficult to look ahead.

21 The National Park Service approached Dr. Obremski
22 and asked for his help. He prepared a very simple forecast.
23 He used an autoregressive one method of forecasting. This
24 forecast increases very slowly and actually flattens out in
25 the year 2009. It's uncomfortable information to receive.

1 His assignment was specifically not to consider what this
2 Committee was doing but to establish baseline foundation.

3 MR. O'QUINN: You may be going to say this,
4 but have we got comparison of similar national parks and
5 what their attendance is and has been?

6 MS. TOWNSEND: Do we have that? Yes.

7 MR. O'QUINN: Are theirs going down also?

8 MS. TOWNSEND: Up, down, sideways, all over
9 the place.

10 MR. O'QUINN: Do we have hiking and camping
11 trends in the United States?

12 MS. TOWNSEND: Yeah.

13 MR. O'QUINN: What are they doing?

14 MS. TOWNSEND: I don't know.

15 MR. BAKER: Maybe if I can just say something
16 on that. The National Park, Canadian parks, Park Canada,
17 when they were doing community plans in the last three years
18 in Canada for Banff, Jasper and Waterton, they did similar
19 forecasts on visitation to the national parks. And this
20 includes Banff; okay? When it came right out, they were
21 basically dead on with what's happening there. They expect
22 things to flatten out and slightly decrease, only their
23 factors were mostly price sensitive. No more growth was
24 allowed. Prices go up, visitors decrease.

25 MS. TOWNSEND: We compared Glacier and

1 Yellowstone, because we thought we might learn something,
2 but we didn't. They don't behave in the same way.

3 MS. PAHL: Do you think the age factor -- I
4 was interested to see that the average age of the visitor is
5 fifty, which may explain the economic level being higher.
6 But I think as the population ages, some of those people
7 with bad knees aren't as inclined to go on a couple days'
8 hiking trips.

9 MS. TOWNSEND: If you're really interested in
10 this piece that the Park Service prepared, I would encourage
11 you to get the entire piece. I've summarized it in the text
12 and, absolutely, they focused on age and all other things
13 equal. That's the problem; all other things equal. As the
14 population ages, we, indeed, might expect an increase to
15 visitation. The problem is the all other things equal,
16 because there are more powerful factors that are
17 unpredictable. That's the problem.

18 MR. O'QUINN: Is there anything in that
19 report with the age of the park facilities and the
20 conditions of them?

21 MS. TOWNSEND: No.

22 MR. O'QUINN: Intuitively, do you think that
23 has anything to do with it?

24 MS. TOWNSEND: Age of the park facilities?

25 MR. O'QUINN: The deterioration of that. If

1 you're 55 years old and you're making \$155,000 a year,
2 you're more inclined to want to stay in nicer places. And,
3 quite frankly, some of the park conditions are going down,
4 not up.

5 MS. TOWNSEND: I think, from a marketing
6 point of view, if -- all other things equal, if you could
7 offer a more diverse set of overnight lodging
8 accommodations, which is where you're going, would you
9 attract an additional segment of the market? Yep, you
10 would. And, actually, the local tourism development
11 specialists are keenly aware of that and are focusing on
12 that. Again, the problem is the all other things equal.
13 That yes, your point is valid. But if gasoline prices spike
14 up or something else, that's so much stronger a factor than
15 that point. So does that mean you don't upgrade lodging
16 accommodations? No, of course, if you can accomplish that
17 and if there's a way to accomplish that.

18 MS. KREMENIK: I'm really surprised how you
19 got to the bottom of the table, the range there. Is that a
20 comfortable range for a prediction like this? Is that
21 something that you think is normal? I thought it was wide.

22 MS. TOWNSEND: It is wide. And it gets wider
23 as the years go on. That is in the nature of the
24 mathematical formula. And like I say, this is uncomfortable
25 to me. But we turned to the best expert in the U.S., and

1 this was his best shot. It still isn't very comfortable.

2 MS. TRIBE: So Jean, you're basically saying
3 forecasting visitor use is really difficult, and we probably
4 would be better served to concentrate on mitigation
5 measures, regardless of what those forecasting numbers say.

6 MS. TOWNSEND: Thank you.

7 MR. JACKSON: There's one thing that is
8 important about these based forecasts, is all that the
9 changes or losses associated with different revenue come off
10 these base forecasts. And I think that's why there should
11 be a lot of thought given to what those are. And I think
12 there should be -- I wouldn't expect a statistician to be
13 able to do anything but do something like a time variable,
14 because there is no statistical theory of the behavior of
15 recreation people.

16 And I think for the EIS, the Park Service, because
17 there is a big number, ought to put some money into getting
18 some good forecasts that are more socioeconomic than this
19 one is. I only say that not to be -- I recognize your
20 struggle with trying to come up with one, but I'm not -- I
21 could do much better than this one, cheap. And a lot of
22 people could. There's a whole bunch of people around. I
23 wouldn't go to a basic statistician to get one. That's what
24 I would say; no more.

25 --o0o--

1 Ms. Townsend then moves to the direct economic
2 impacts; quantify the direct economic impacts for each of
3 the alternatives. Chosen to do that was by measuring
4 decreases in visitor days and visitor expenditures from
5 Alternative 1, which was used as the base case.

6 If the Committee endorsed Alternative 3, over the
7 nine years there would be a 1.9 million reduction in
8 visitation, which is about a 13-percent reduction. And
9 similarly, visitor expenditure reduction of 190 million over
10 the nine-year period in constant 2000 dollars.

11 Using the same style of math, under Alternative 4,
12 the visitor reduction would be larger and larger percentage
13 wise, and the visitor expenditure reduction would be larger
14 and larger percentage wise. And the reason is under
15 Alternative 4, there are more severe road travel
16 restrictions than under 3. To do the calculations, the team
17 went back and used the contingent behavior information from
18 the surveys: If this happened, what would you do? So that
19 was the basis of the reductions. That was why the questions
20 were asked in the visitor surveys from the beginning.

21 Then in Alternative 5, over the seven-year period,
22 the reduction measured in visitors or visitor expenditures
23 would be the most.

24 She adds that David approached her before the
25 presentation and had some more technical questions about

1 visits versus visitors versus visitations, and they are
2 going to visit about that.

3 The fun part of the presentation at one of the
4 previous Advisory Committee meetings, Tony was very
5 insistent, and appropriately so, that it's going to be some
6 sort of negative impact, don't spend a lot of time trying to
7 quantify it to the nth degree, would you please just fast
8 forward and focus on mitigation strategies. Which the
9 Committee insisted no longer be called mitigation strategies
10 but be called visitor development strategies. Jean thought
11 that was remarkable foresight. Unlike almost any other
12 study that's done, the team fast forwarded to Okay, if
13 there's going to be some sort of reduction in visitors, what
14 do we do?

15 The method that was used to develop these visitor
16 development strategies was grassroots. These aren't really
17 Jean's recommendations. These are recommendations from the
18 local economic development and tourism development
19 specialists. They met in September of 2000, had a
20 brainstorming session what might be done, came up with a
21 preliminary list of actions. Jean and her team went back
22 and did some more homework on these ideas, came back and had
23 a second session in January and February of 2001 where,
24 again, the local tourism and economic development
25 specialists ranked the ideas. So these aren't really Jean's

1 rankings, these are their rankings.

2 They were ranked two ways. For each idea it was
3 sort of thumbs up, thumbs down; great idea, I don't care,
4 get this idea off the table. And so they ranked them that
5 way. And then they were asked to spend a hundred points, so
6 that if they thought one idea was just dynamite, they could
7 spend their points that way. So the top 15 ideas that came
8 out of that process are as follows: These aren't ranked 1
9 through 15, these are just by category. These are the ideas
10 that percolated to the surface.

11 There were four backbone facilities. 1. Physical
12 improvements. Very strong interest in upgrading public
13 transportation, both through the Park and to the Park. A
14 ton of detailed ideas on that topic. 2. Strong interest in
15 improving roads adjacent to the Park. In the text there's
16 some specific roads that were mentioned.

17 Two things that are important. One is the Park
18 Service staff chose not to participate in these meetings
19 because they felt if they participated, they would become
20 the meeting. So they consciously chose not to participate
21 in these meetings so that these ideas would really be from
22 the community. You will see some ideas in here that are
23 contrary to the General Management Plan. So there were no
24 restrictions placed on the participants. It wasn't an
25 inside the Park/outside the Park. There were no

1 restrictions. The question was what should be done.

2 3. Upgrade and construct outdoor amphitheaters.

3 And the reason is to improve the quality of the visitor
4 experience. It might extend the visitor experience and it

5 might bring people to the east side more. 4. Upgrade and
6 winterize historic hotels. This is contrary to the General

7 Management Plan. The distinction between the two words,
8 "upgrade" and "winterize"; one is in the management plan,

9 one is not. "Winterize" is not in the management plan.

10 However, that said, the local community wants to extend the
11 visitor stay on the shoulder season, wants to attract more
12 conferences and feels like it's a good idea. The management
13 plan does not speak to this idea of upgrading and
14 constructing new amphitheaters; it's quiet in that regard.

15 The Park Service has identified some ways to
16 improve the west side amphitheater. This concept includes
17 also building a new amphitheater on the east side, perhaps
18 in the Park, perhaps on the reservation.

19 A number of marketing event ideas came up in the
20 first meeting, but the only marketing idea that survived the
21 process was 5. To use the Lewis and Clark bicentennial
22 events. There's an additional two to four million visitors
23 expected into the State of Montana. The thinking was for
24 the east side communities to use that opportunity. For the
25 west side counties, Can we come up with circle tours to

1 extend their visit to get them over to Flathead and Lake
2 County? 6. Improve hyertext linkages and websites. The
3 whole state already does a wonderful job in website design
4 and linkages. That said, they want to invest more time and
5 effort, hire somebody on a daily basis, is looking for
6 additional ways to link the community that's connected via
7 the web. 7. Change visitor prospect information to
8 introduce other visitor sites within the Park. A lot of
9 people tend to send visitors to the same spots within the
10 Park, and there are a lot of other spots to go see. This
11 simply speaks to changing the way the Park is marketed to
12 visitors. It doesn't cost very much. Some of these ideas
13 cost a whole ton of money, some of them don't cost much at
14 all. 7 would be one of them. 8. Improve the visitor
15 experience for those stopped on the road. Now, this is you
16 drive up and, you don't have a four-hour stop but you have a
17 30-minute stop, entertain those people. Give them
18 information, present a little skit. Tell them about Linda's
19 bear cookies. Linda's idea is to go to each car and give
20 them bear cookies and some water. Turn lemons into lemonade
21 kind of idea. 9. Activate public information to aid
22 visitors and businesses. Actually, this is huge. Doesn't
23 necessarily cost a lot of money, it's not a physical
24 improvement, and Joe alluded to this. People need very
25 clear, very accurate information that's updated all the

1 time. The visitors need it, the businesses need it.
2 Although it didn't make a top list, the businesses were
3 talking about being given information. Give them extremely
4 accurate information. This requires a lot of coordination.
5 10. Manage the media more effectively. You cannot manage
6 the media, but the point is get the message out before the
7 message is crafted by others.

8 There are three visitor experience mitigation
9 ideas. 11. We have wonderful events within the two
10 reservations that celebrate Native American heritage, and
11 there are many, many people that would like to learn more
12 about the Native American culture. This is to help get that
13 message out regarding existing ceremonies and events, as
14 well as expand the number of events. 12. Broaden National
15 Park Service services at visitor centers. Increase staff,
16 build a better visitor center on the west side so that
17 information can be gotten out more specifically and people
18 can be introduced to other sites other than just going over
19 Going-to-the-Sun Road. 13. Open more of Glacier National
20 Park to visitors. Now, this is talking about new camp
21 sites, additional trails, which is not consistent with the
22 management plan. An idea that would be consistent with the
23 managements plan is to rate the trails like ski trails are
24 rated; difficult, easy, whatever. Rate the trails.
25 Everybody thinks you might have to be an Olympian to take

1 the trails. And that way would actually open up more of the
2 Park to more people.

3 Last, two organizational ideas. There's a
4 wonderful local program Our State, a statewide program put
5 on regarding hospitality training, training anybody that has
6 contact with visitors, sponsored by Flathead Community
7 College. 14. Is to underscore the significance of that
8 ongoing program; not change it but underscore the
9 significance. Maybe help fund it more so when people leave
10 they can say they had a wonderful experience, all the people
11 are so kind; a good feeling. 15. The individual economic
12 develop organization feels the need to communicate and
13 cooperate more than they do. They are still surprised about
14 what each other does.

15 In closing, Jean asks Linda Anderson to add a few
16 remarks. Linda was chair of the Committee's socioeconomic
17 working group.

18 Ms. Anderson thanks Jean. She was a delight to
19 work with. The subcommittee had a lot to do in a short
20 amount of time with a lot of people who were either busy or
21 gone.

22 Just to reiterate, there were two different
23 studies done. Obviously one was from the business community
24 but we also wanted to make sure that we listened and looked
25 at this last part that we've been talking about that came

1 from the tourism community, because they're the people that
2 are providing the service for the visitors. What came out
3 of these meetings was kind of like you always hear;
4 "location, location, location." What came out of this was
5 open, open, open. Nobody wants to use the word "closed."
6 It's been removed from our vocabulary several years ago.

7 An interesting thing learned is that we all assume
8 that Whitefish is our skiing community and that the majority
9 of their business comes in the wintertime, and that's not
10 true. Their numbers pretty much follow the Park's numbers.
11 July and August is the busiest time in Whitefish, and the
12 reason for that is Glacier National Park. It's not because
13 of the ski area. They're the only area right now in Glacier
14 Country that collects a resort tax. 50 percent of their
15 resort tax is collected in July and August. If the visitors
16 were extended one more month in September, that would be
17 almost another 50 percent or 25 percent of what they're
18 already collecting. So what the tourism community is trying
19 to back up with all of this is that summer is really when
20 the business comes in and when the business is made. The
21 demographics did not surprise Linda. They're pretty much
22 the target market used all the time, looking at forty-five
23 to sixty-year old people. They're the ones with the money
24 and the time. And the demographics pretty much follow
25 what's happening in the ski areas. The baby boomers are

1 killing their knees. They can't ski anymore, they can't
2 hike anymore. So that pretty much follows along with the
3 age factors that were in that study.

4 Another factor talked about was upgrading and
5 winterizing the hotels. And as noted, those are two
6 different things. One thing needing to be remembered is the
7 hotels definitely do need to be upgraded, but in the
8 Flathead area, there are over 2,500 rooms that could be used
9 in the winter, as well as some on the east side.

10 The other thing that was reiterated to Linda with
11 the tourism community is there is a need to provide
12 alternatives and stretch these out into the communities, and
13 that's where the amphitheater comes along. There's
14 tremendous interest in cultural and heritage tourism.
15 Everybody wants to know about Native American history.
16 That's why putting the amphitheater into the east side and
17 Browning and making better use of the ones on the west side
18 so that the visitors could be stretched out when Joe has the
19 road partially closed was discussed.

20 The idea behind the joke of serving cookies is
21 that sitting in the Park with a 30-minute delay is a heck of
22 a lot better than sitting on 405 in Los Angeles. So the
23 combination of educating people, talking to them, telling
24 them what's going on, having information available for them,
25 would certainly make that a better visitor experience, and

1 then they would want to come back.

2 Mr. Jackson reminds the Committee that Glacier
3 Park, in a lot of ways, is more like a wilderness area than
4 Yellowstone, and Yellowstone is, in fact, growing slowly,
5 whereas Glacier trends have, in fact, peaked and started to
6 drop.

7 And there's other issues with the exchange rates
8 and so on which are very important with business to Glacier
9 because of the Canadian proximity. It is more expensive for
10 Canadians, now, to travel in the U.S. than it used to be,
11 because of the exchange rates. But on the other hand, it's
12 cheaper for Americans to go to Canada, and Glacier, of
13 course, happens to be that gateway, so it's really a two-way
14 road. Those are the kinds of things that can be forecast in
15 the next ten years or so; that there isn't the booming
16 growth in wilderness like 15 years ago, and those are the
17 kinds of things that would lead someone to suspect that
18 Glacier isn't going to drop like a rock, but it isn't going
19 to be the growing park, no matter what happens to the road.
20 And that's really important to understand, is the baseline
21 for all this stuff with mitigation and trying to minimize
22 the cost of rehabilitating the road.

23 Ms. Tribe reiterates two points that are together;
24 one being the road may not be the only reason that things
25 are going down or leveling off, and the second point being

1 that we may not be able to do a whole lot about the leveling
2 off.

3 At this time, Ms. Tribe thanks Jean Townsend and
4 Linda Anderson for their presentations and suggests everyone
5 take a ten-minute break.

6 (Proceedings in recess from 4:35 p.m. to
7 4:40 p.m.)

8 Chairman Ogle directs the Committee's attention to
9 Objective 1 of today's agenda: To verify that the condition
10 of the Going-to-the-Sun Road is in need of comprehensive
11 rehabilitation. He asks if there is any debate on that
12 issue. There being little discussion, it is agreed a
13 consensus is reached to verify.

14 Ms. Tribe directs the Committee to Objective 2:
15 To have reviewed the consultants' proposed actions in the
16 engineering document and concur with or change the
17 prioritized actions.

18 She explains the task for the Committee, as the
19 Worksheet #1 - Proposed Actions is handed to each member.
20 The first task is to read and review pages 38 and 130 to 136
21 of the Engineering Report and/or sections XI and XII of the
22 Executive Summary conclusions and recommendations.

23 Individually, this is how the Committee members
24 are to review for the next day's actions. Read and review
25 the sheet for Objective 2, and then make notes for

1 themselves. What clarifying questions do you have? Do you
2 understand everything? What are your initial reactions?
3 Think about what criteria that should be used tomorrow when
4 looking at those priorities in terms of both road segment
5 and the elements; drainage, tunnels, et cetera. What
6 interests do you bring to the table? And based on those
7 interests, what do you want the Committee to consider in
8 their discussion and evaluation of the proposed actions?
9 Think about the interests that each member brings to the
10 table and then, based on those interests, what does each
11 member want this Committee to consider in their discussion
12 and evaluation of those proposed actions that they're going
13 to read about. What are the most important outcomes for
14 you, based on your interests? The members need to be
15 collaborative but also need to say to themselves Unless we
16 can take care of our own interests here, we're not going to
17 come to consensus. So what are the most important outcomes
18 for you related to the proposed actions?

19 Those are the issues that will be discussed
20 tomorrow, the 20th; whether or not the Committee agrees with
21 the prioritization that Joe and the engineers have put
22 together in that table and, if not, why? And are you
23 recommending that they look at it in a different way? Also,
24 to give any additional advice the members would like to give
25 related to those particular proposed actions. Like get the

1 rock here, only use yellow, whatever those things might be.

2 The reason for looking at the proposed actions
3 first is because it was thought if priorities were discussed
4 and sort of framed what those actions were going to look
5 like, it would be easier to look at the alternatives.

6 (Whereupon the Committee members commenced their
7 Objective 2 assignment at 4:55 p.m. until 5:15 p.m. when the
8 public comment period commenced.)

9 MR. CRISSMAN: Good afternoon. I'm Philip
10 Crissman. I'm the director of the Burlington Northern
11 Environmental Stewardship Area. And I want to start just by
12 thanking you all for the work that you're doing here.
13 Following the progress of what you're examining, I
14 appreciate, more than ever, the complexity and the challenge
15 of what you're facing.

16 As a -- in my position with the Burlington
17 Northern Environmental Stewardship Area, BNESA, I think
18 there's some information that might be of value to some of
19 the objectives of the Committee.

20 I just want to take a moment to let you -- give
21 you some information about what BNESA is. It's not a
22 railroad organization. BNESA was named for the railroad
23 because of their leadership role in the events that followed
24 the grain spills, you might recall, in 1989 and '91 that
25 resulted in the deaths of way too many grizzly bears.

1 Essentially, that crisis kind of brought together an
2 awareness, from a large group of organizations, that manage
3 and work in this area here that in order to meet the demands
4 of such a complex and critical area, there had to be a much
5 higher degree of communication and collaboration amongst all
6 the agencies, the people who live there and everyone else,
7 in order to basically do the right thing. In order to
8 conduct any human commerce in that area, without
9 unnecessarily being destructive to either the environment or
10 the wildlife habitat there.

11 So BNESEA was formed, as an umbrella organization,
12 that brought together -- it's a big tent; Glacier National
13 Park, the Burlington Northern Railroad, the Forest Service,
14 two counties, the Blackfeet Indian Nation, private property
15 owners, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Montana
16 Fish, Wildlife and Parks, a lot of different interests and a
17 lot of complex things that manage and are present in this
18 area. And this map gives you just a basic idea. We're
19 talking about the corridor from West Glacier over to East
20 Glacier. It's approximately 60 miles and follows the Middle
21 Fork of the Flathead River and then rises up over the
22 Continental Divide here.

23 Essentially, this is a very critical area in many
24 different ways. This map here, you can -- I can pass this
25 around later if you want to look. It's just a very

1 interesting rendition of the northern Rockies. We're
2 looking from about 20 miles up right here. This corridor
3 right here, that's the southern boundary of Glacier Park, is
4 the only year-round transportation corridor from Highway 200
5 to the south here, all the way up to Crow's Nest Pass in
6 Canada. That's 170 miles of uninterrupted and contiguous
7 wildlands and very critical wildlife habitat. So what
8 happens in this corridor here is now recognized as being
9 very crucial to wildlife continuity and ecological
10 continuity in this area.

11 Recognizing this -- and I've lived here for 30
12 years. And I think, like many people, having big sister of
13 a park right here and Great Bear Wilderness on this side,
14 many people don't really recognize or appreciate the unique
15 qualities of this Pacific Corridor and the Middle Fork River
16 and what it offers there. Since I've been the director of
17 this organization, I feel like I've sort of become
18 enlightened about how unique and special this area is. And
19 I think it offers some important qualities in your challenge
20 to mitigate both the visitor and economic impact and
21 whatever you decide to do with the Going-to-the-Sun Road.

22 In specific, I passed out, in front of you, the
23 same letter that was distributed to you in June. It came
24 across in PowerPoint then, and I wondered if it gave you any
25 difficulties then. I wanted to be sure you had a copy of it

1 again. And just to hit the high points, looking at the
2 executive summary, what we're looking for was both an
3 alternative for visitor activity, other than the road, an
4 opportunity for increasing education, which is an essential
5 part of BNESA's mission, and mitigating economic impact.

6 To be very brief with what we're bringing to you
7 is a plan that BNESA had sort of looked at as a very
8 long-range plan for education, which was a series of
9 interpretive sites along the Middle Fork corridor that would
10 offer education, cultural heritage, historical information
11 that would allow the visitor to this area, rather than just
12 using this highway as sort of a way to get around to the
13 other side of the Park; to recognize the true value of
14 what's right here in this corridor. And there's a lot.

15 That plan got kind of sped up a little bit when I
16 learned about your work and how this might really fit
17 together with what you're looking for right now, in terms of
18 mitigation. So we put together this idea to take it this
19 far. And essentially, I wanted to have this opportunity to
20 make sure that if you had any questions about this, that I
21 could be here to answer them for you. And I think that with
22 that, I will just turn you over to any questions you might
23 have for me. And I can go on and talk about it. I don't
24 want to take up more time than you really want to use for
25 it.

1 MS. TRIBE: Any clarifying questions?

2 MR. JEWETT: Phil, could you just talk a
3 little bit about how you see the project that we're working
4 on; what are the two or three impacts that would either run
5 counter or run positively concurrent with the goals that
6 you're working on in this corridor?

7 MR. CRISSMAN: Right. I went down the points
8 that you had in your Executive Summary, and basically hit
9 the ones that would correspond with what BNESA would be both
10 very capable and willing, and ideally suited, to play a role
11 in, and what was consistent with our mission statement as an
12 organization.

13 Those were basically -- you have in your
14 statement, upgrading and contracting outdoor amphitheaters.
15 Essentially, the interpretive displays fall under that
16 category. And we're looking, particularly, at those that
17 would emphasize the environmental dynamics of this corridor
18 and the unique wildlife information of this corridor, as
19 well as the historical issues.

20 I think that what we're doing here, in meeting the
21 complex challenge of trying to conduct that intensive of a
22 human commerce in an area that is this sensitive, has
23 basically asked us to come up with some innovative solutions
24 to doing that. And I think what BNESA offers, as an
25 organization, is quite unique. This is a partnership that

1 has brought together a very wide variety of organizations.
2 And this alone is a piece of information that I think would
3 be of interest to the public. Here's how sensitive this
4 area is. Here's the unique qualities of this area. Here's
5 the challenges we have of conducting our human affairs. And
6 Here's how we, here in the northern Rockies, are attempting
7 to meet this challenge. So the organization alone and the
8 model of what we're doing represents a piece of information
9 I think is of value to all the public going through.

10 Suzann.

11 MS. LEWIS: I want to see if you'll clarify
12 in your comments that you submitted, is it safe for our
13 Committee to assume that many of the proposals you have in
14 here are unfunded needs, that are unfunded actions that
15 BNESA would like to take?

16 MR. CRISSMAN: Yes, it's very safe to assume
17 that. I think even the most preliminary steps in this,
18 which would probably be those steps that would be to bring
19 together all the district organizations involved, and we'd
20 be talking about development, in some cases, on properties
21 that would be managed by the United States Forest Service,
22 therefore the Department of Agriculture; the Park,
23 Department of Interior; over here on the east side, issues
24 that may affect the Tribe, and we would very much like their
25 involvement in it. And we also, all the way along, want to

1 do this in an environmentally sensitive manner. And that's
2 a principal part of BNESA's organization.

3 The time required to do that, the time required to
4 get the kinds of information I think you'd need as a
5 Committee to even take this a step further, perhaps that
6 being in actual site proposals, in a very general way, these
7 would be like five sites that we'd be looking at to develop,
8 and probably finding an architectural design firm that could
9 give us a range of cost estimates based on how elaborate
10 these sites would be, that you, as a Committee, or whoever
11 it is that makes this decision, would be able to examine to
12 take this a step further. That would cost money to even get
13 that part off the ground. Does that answer your question?

14 MR. BABB: I'd just like to add one thing to
15 Philip. Philip came in, and we talked over the summer. And
16 we sort of compared our goals, both short-term, during
17 construction, as well as long-term. And we felt that there
18 was really a match there. So I just wanted to emphasize
19 there's two parts to it or two parts to the equation, long
20 and short-term during construction and then, obviously,
21 after the rehabilitation effort.

22 MR. BAKER: It's kind of weird that I've
23 never heard of this before, but it's very unusual. For the
24 last year I've been having conversations with a variety of
25 people up in Canada, all the way from park superintendents

1 at Banff and Jasper, regional directors, park planners,
2 et cetera. And we talk about the Crown of the Continent.
3 We talk about the Y to Y Corridor.

4 One of the things that always keeps popping up,
5 and it becomes of particular interest when I tell them that
6 I sit on this advisory board is Glacier National Park and
7 the Going-to-the-Sun Highway. And how everybody -- you
8 know, they comment and they say Boy, if we could redo that,
9 If that was our park, we could redo that, what's the one
10 thing that we would do? And it is felt by a lot of people
11 that for so many years so much emphasis has been put on the
12 Going-to-the-Sun corridor within Glacier National Park,
13 because it was the easier resource to fund and manage, that
14 the other parts of the Park and the Crown of the Continent
15 system have been neglected. And we're talking like 30, 40
16 years here. Just about every one of them said The first
17 thing we'd do is make it into a one-way loop, either a loop
18 south or a loop north, but we have a problem at the bottom
19 end of the Park because there doesn't seem to be anything
20 there, and on the east side of the Park it almost seems as
21 if they're trying to hide it.

22 And this is actually great to see this come out.
23 Because in a lot of people's minds, this is what's needed to
24 spread the people out within the Park and the Crown of the
25 Continent ecosystem. I commend you for doing this; this is

1 great.

2 MR. CRISSMAN: Thank you.

3 MR. JEWETT: I'd just like to get your
4 thoughts, Phil, on Fred's comment where he said there's both
5 a short-term as well as a long-term role that Park planning
6 around transportation could play in integrating Highway 2
7 with Park transportation plans. And I see your
8 goals -- BNESA's goals as being more long-term than
9 short-term. Certainly, the short term Going-to-the-Sun Road
10 rehabilitation to be used to launch planning around
11 Highway 2 and environmental education by increasing
12 low-impact recreational visitors.

13 Could you give me some thoughts about long-term,
14 and have you thought about exactly -- actually what was just
15 said by Brian, which is an idea that, I think, has a lot of
16 merit, which is a loop that includes Highway 2 to the east
17 side highway Going-to-the-Sun Road?

18 MR. CRISSMAN: Well, I haven't specifically
19 ever addressed the idea of a loop. It's an interesting
20 concept.

21 When I floated this idea about these interpretive
22 areas to various members of BNESA, I encountered a response
23 that I would call mixed. I heard a great deal of concern
24 about -- this is an extremely pristine area, still, much
25 like the Park itself. For the fact that there's a highway

1 and a national highway with a year-round average of about
2 2,400 cars that travel over it, a railway that runs around
3 32 trains through a day, about a mile long each train, this
4 is considered to be, still, a remarkably pristine and intact
5 environment. 75 percent of the waters of the Middle Fork of
6 the Flathead flow either from the Great Bear Wilderness/Bob
7 Marshall complex or from the Park. Jack Stanford has been
8 doing -- he's the director at Yellow Bay Research Center at
9 Flathead Lake, and has been doing research in Nyack Flats
10 area in here for nearly ten years. And his findings, in his
11 words, are getting basically worldwide scientific attention
12 for this watershed and what we're learning about the
13 dynamics of watersheds from it.

14 So the kind of mixed response that I've heard from
15 people is a concern about Gosh, do we want to increase the
16 impact of human use in this corridor? The basic answer that
17 we've come to out of this, the consensus, you could say, is
18 that the belief that -- it's the belief in that adage that
19 education, making us informed, breeds caring; caring leads
20 us eventually to action to protect an area. We understand
21 it, we care about it, and we protect it.

22 I think that I can speak for BNESA, in general, to
23 say that the consensus here is that if this kind of
24 development -- we're looking at long-term -- if this kind of
25 development is done in a way that is looking at the

1 long-term impacts to this pristine environment, to this
2 critical habitat environment, if we do it in that type of a
3 manner, we're ahead by increasing some of the visitor use in
4 the area, if we succeed in producing people -- I mean, that
5 leave our visitor areas that are enriched by this by the
6 information that they've gotten, their sensitivity to the
7 area and their basic education about what such an
8 area -- the complexities of the area and the challenges it
9 holds. So I think I'm getting at your long-term question
10 there. Am I?

11 MR. JEWETT: You are. You addressed the
12 conflict part of it. Certainly, I would assume BNESA's goal
13 is to -- if there is development, it is no-impact
14 development. That the development is development that is
15 put in place in order to maintain it as it is, as well as
16 educate, because the goal is to not impact the resource of
17 the bears; is that correct? But at the same time, if
18 you -- if that is your goal and you begin to look at the
19 displace to disperse more visitors, that's a long-term goal
20 that has to be definitely coordinated with the Park as well
21 as this Committee has a role there too.

22 MR. CRISSMAN: My understanding about these
23 types of developments is they're sort of a continuum of
24 steps that can be taken. There can be just a highway
25 pullout with a sign. There can be a highway pullout that's

1 set up in a manner to encourage people to get out of their
2 cars and read, maybe, several different interpretive signs
3 and look at a particularly beautiful view that site has
4 created. There are sites that include restrooms, that's a
5 whole other significant step of complexities. And then
6 there's the issue of do we want to promote some of the
7 hiking and trail potentials that this area offers that would
8 also open it up to the visitor that came through the area as
9 to how beautiful and unique it is.

10 One of the issues that gets raised by any of these
11 questions is -- in fact, I had an officer with the Forest
12 Service just yesterday that I was with say We don't want any
13 new developments that we don't have funding to maintain.
14 That's a significant problem we've got. We've had to close
15 things that have already been developed, because we don't
16 have the money to contract people to come and clean up the
17 restroom or clean up the garbage cans or make sure that this
18 area doesn't become an attractant to wildlife. So
19 long-term, maintenance funding has to be built into any plan
20 that we would pursue in this corridor.

21 MS. TRIBE: Philip, thank you very much for
22 coming.

23 MR. CRISSMAN: Thank you for this
24 opportunity.

25 MS. TRIBE: And I understand there's someone

1 who's going to read the next.

2 MS. HERVOL: This first one is from Mary
3 Erickson of Microtel Inn and Suites, out of Missoula.

4 "Closing the Going-to-the-Sun Road for any
5 appreciable length of time could be very damaging to tourism
6 on this side of the state. Even here in the Missoula
7 hotels, we see many of our casual clientele headed for
8 Glacier Park. Many of our business clientele also often
9 include an extra day for a quick trip over the
10 Going-to-the-Sun Road. It is a man-made phenomenon that
11 allows us access to a phenomenon of nature that visitors
12 have little opportunity to see elsewhere. Since Montana is
13 already fighting the stigma of 'fire' in decreased tourist
14 numbers, I ask that you not add to the problem. Closing of
15 the road for even one season could take years of intensive
16 and expensive promotion to overcome in the minds of
17 travelers and travel agencies. If you must, pick a day and
18 close it every week, like Wednesday, when use may be less,
19 but please do not close it entirely."

20 And the second comment is from the Glacier Raft
21 Company, which is based out of West Glacier.

22 "Dear Going-to-the-Sun Advisory Committee. After
23 reviewing the engineering, socioeconomic and transportation
24 and visitor use studies, it seems that unless something
25 changes dramatically on Going-to-the-Sun Road, the next few

1 years will see an effort to repair and improve drainage and
2 that no major actions will happen until NEPA analysis is
3 complete. Some combination of Alternatives 3 and 4 seem
4 reasonable, and we would like to offer some observations and
5 thoughts on how the support businesses and guests around
6 Glacier might best work with that effort.

7 "Improved shuttle service could cut down on the
8 volume of cars allowing more work to be performed.

9 "We generally support the maintenance of the
10 historic road alignment and style, but feel that it is
11 appropriate to look at alternatives such as minor
12 realignment and options like snow/rock sheds. A major
13 rebuild of the road should not perpetuate persistent problem
14 areas unless no reasonable alternative exists.

15 "If the repair need is critical, we think the road
16 could be closed and dedicated to construction (9:00 p.m. to
17 6:00 a.m.) to minimize the impact on traffic during the day.

18 "With forewarning in years to come, our business
19 could deal with a complete closure of the road from mid
20 September until June 15th, if we saw a 24-hour-a-day effort
21 going during the closure when the weather allowed. Adequate
22 forewarning for businesses and visitors might be a year
23 ahead. We think this kind of effort would be well supported
24 if we felt the need was genuine, the construction effort
25 continual, and that the impact on the core of the summer was

1 minimized because of the effort.

2 "To maximize the results of the spring
3 construction, every effort would need to be implemented to
4 get the road open early. Having spent the last thirty years
5 working in high elevation, heavy snow, avalanche-prone snow
6 removal efforts, we offer the following observations:

7 "1) The spring snow removal effort needs to
8 have a professional avalanche forecaster on staff as part of
9 the team. In addition to local talent in and around
10 Glacier, there are several very capable forecasters in the
11 west that could be available at that time of the year.

12 "2) The bulk of the snow removal effort
13 should be let out to a private contractor that is
14 financially motivated to get the job done.

15 "3) The snow removal effort should be geared
16 up to work at whatever time of the day poses the best
17 conditions. Midday warming of the spring snowpack often
18 creates the highest avalanche hazard of the day. A private
19 contractor, not constrained by normal work hours, could
20 certainly speed up the process. Snow removal at night is a
21 very normal occurrence.

22 "If Glacier National Park and the contractors
23 communicate well with the business community, we feel they
24 will get good support. A well-planned effort should be able
25 to rebuild and repair the road while minimizing the impact

1 on guests and businesses during the summer."

2 Ms. Tribe thanks Deb Hervol for reading the last
3 two public comments into the record. She then directs the
4 Committee members to continue with their assigned task for
5 the following day and that they must remain until 6:15 p.m.
6 when the public comment period is over.

7 Dayna Hudson advises that the room is not secured,
8 so anything of value needs to be removed.

9 (The public comment period ended at 6:15 p.m.;
10 whereupon the proceedings were recessed until Thursday,
11 September 20, 2001 at 8:00 a.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 --o0o--

21

22

23

24

25

1 The second day of the third meeting of the
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee was called to order
3 at 8:00 a.m., Thursday, September 20, 2001, by Virginia
4 Tribe, facilitator.

5 Ms. Tribe advised any members of the public in the
6 audience that this is an open, public meeting, but public
7 testimony is being accepted only at specific times on the
8 agenda.

9 Virginia reminded the Committee of their tasks
10 today. She then wants the members to, going around the
11 room, state what they learned yesterday, one important
12 thing.

13 MR. MEZNARICH: What I learned yesterday was
14 the cost figures did not include changes, signage, visitor
15 mitigation opportunities were not included in that and that
16 was pretty important.

17 MR. DAKIN: I think I was able to understand
18 how the landscape report and the engineering report fit
19 together, and I got a much better sense of the historic
20 standards that we were shooting for on the whole project.

21 MS. BURCH: I actually didn't learn it, but I
22 was reminded we all bring a unique perspective to the
23 process and we were like letters to the editors.

24 MR. BAKER: I think the one thing that I
25 failed to realize, and I guess I learned yesterday, was

1 that, basically, this whole process is going to get repeated
2 in the EIS.

3 MR. MCDONALD: I guess I was refreshed on
4 many things, but I was encouraged when Joe talked about the
5 scaling and being able to use some of the -- quite a bit of
6 the rock from the scaling work and that proposed a type of
7 alternative back on the structure.

8 MS. MOE: I guess mine was coming to an
9 understanding that on some of their alternatives, when they
10 said that the road is closed, that doesn't mean from point A
11 to -- I mean, from end to end. It's just certain segments
12 are closed.

13 MR. O'QUINN: There seems to be -- and I
14 guess you learn it, I'm not certain of this yet -- but it
15 seems to me, over the last year and a half, a change in
16 attitude of the local population about the time frame of
17 construction. When we started this a year and a half ago,
18 it was -- came out of the fact that there was a lot of
19 opposition to closing part of the road for a period of time
20 and then closing the other part for a period of time. And
21 it seems to me there may be a change in that attitude, for
22 instance, an understanding on the locals in the community,
23 whereas the press and what have you that have come out of
24 all this. People are opposed to what they don't understand.

25 MS. KREMENIK: I usually need about three

1 cups of coffee to do this. I'm on my first one. I'll have
2 to agree with Brian. I'm learning more about the process
3 and how these things get put together and how the EIS works
4 and what we're doing here, so it's not something that's as
5 apparent in the systems. It was a learning process how to
6 do things.

7 MR. BLACK: Being a new kid on the block, you
8 know, there were a lot of things that were interesting and
9 new to me. But one of the most important factors that I
10 think I saw brought up was the fact that our visitation is
11 going to flatline on us and, you know, in the hospital, if
12 you flatline, you go dead.

13 MS. TRIBE: I'm gonna shake his hand on that
14 one.

15 MR. BLACK: But all of our projections and
16 everything that we're doing always has been from, Gee, our
17 visitation in 1992 was 2.2 million. And if we multiply that
18 by the increases that we had prior to 1992, by 2010 or 2015
19 we're going to have three million people going through the
20 Park. And it was very interesting that by 2009, we're not
21 even going to be back to 2 million.

22 MS. TRIBE: So when you represent local
23 folks, it causes us to think, in a planning mode, about the
24 operating environment, about age.

25 MR. BLACK: On top of that, I would say that

1 we looked at it and said Gee, if we can get the road done,
2 we're going to get back to 2.2 million visitors, and the
3 cash flow is going to get back to where it was, and we're
4 all going to be happy, and it's just going to continue to
5 increase, and we'll all end up, indeed, having a wonderful
6 time. I don't think that's the case. But if we do take a
7 hit because of the road rehabilitation, then it's going to
8 come from where we are at a much later baseline.

9 MS. TRIBE: So it really behooves us to think
10 seriously about the road and what we do.

11 MS. PAHL: Well, I learned that -- the point
12 that most of the visitors didn't know about the road or
13 would come anyway, and the road would impact their visits,
14 in my view, didn't go along with the math that showed this
15 huge economic cost to the road project. So I've discovered
16 that I don't understand math as well as I thought I did, in
17 terms of how those figures could be so high, when it looked
18 like it wasn't going to drastically affect visitation.

19 MR. JEWETT: You know, I thought -- I learned
20 a lot. I thought Jean's stuff was incredibly rich in a lot
21 of the information that it provided. So it's hard to sort.
22 By the way, I was reminded, as we all were, that in no
23 uncertain terms, that we're reconstructing it, and I want to
24 keep track of that today so we don't have any problems over
25 here; okay? We've got some games planned for Barb today.

1 And I think that I was -- if I had to pick out one
2 thing that I was struck by, I was struck by the willingness
3 of huge majorities of people to continue to visit the Park,
4 regardless of if the road was restricted or not.

5 And I think the second most important interesting
6 thing was the consistency of approach to both the road and
7 the activities on the road and what the road would do and
8 how to treat the road in the future by a wide variety of
9 constituencies, not just visitors, but local businesses and
10 local residents. There was a lot of common themes working
11 through the data that she brought forward.

12 MS. TRIBE: That goes to the comments that
13 Barney made, as people come to learn about things and
14 understand them who were once in opposition, they might be
15 able to find a solution.

16 MS. ANDERSON: I found it much more
17 educational to listen to Joe talk about the different
18 alternatives yesterday. In the past, things, to me, were
19 all garbled. I couldn't -- I couldn't come up, in my own
20 mind, which was the best way to do it. And the way he broke
21 this out really helped me, not being an engineer.

22 And I guess what I learned about the
23 rehabilitation was, with the extended season, that it would
24 give us about a year less construction, and that was really
25 interesting to me. And I found it interesting that we can't

1 do three shifts, that we can't work at night, and that was a
2 question in my mind as to why they can't work at night; and
3 the things that I hadn't thought about, that the snow
4 removal is going to add to the cost, those kinds of things.
5 It just really helped me put notes on that and helped me
6 figure out in my mind.

7 MS. TRIBE: One of the things you're saying
8 is you can read about the alternatives, but when someone
9 talks about the alternatives, it brings them to life.

10 MR. JACKSON: Well, I think the interesting
11 thing was the group was formed after a perception that the
12 road was going to create kind of a holocaust for local
13 businesses. And then what I saw yesterday in the
14 engineering stuff was that, really, the extra cost of kind
15 of allowing continued use of the road over simply shutting
16 it down and redoing it wasn't that great. So that kind of
17 the combination of delays and stoppages and closures and
18 stuff at night and so on, actually produces a pretty
19 manageable consequence, I think, to people around here, much
20 more so than I think was the perception when we started.
21 And I think that was pretty enlightening to me. So I think
22 that's actually kind of gratifying to see.

23 MS. TRIBE: So for somebody who kind of plays
24 around with economics as a hobby, the idea that some
25 mitigation measures or some changes in how we let people

1 through or not, it's not like three times more, and that's
2 helpful.

3 MR. JACKSON: Very helpful, yes.

4 I might also add that the last part that Jean
5 presented, which now starts to take on, I think; that there
6 are going to be opportunities that will come out of
7 construction activity, that people can capitalize on them
8 and make it a different, more interesting experience in its
9 own way. And I think that's really a real positive kind of
10 way of looking at it. Again, I think they're realistic,
11 too.

12 MS. STEWART: I think the biggest thing I
13 learned are the mitigation strategies and reconstruction are
14 separate issues. I've kind of lumped them together. And
15 David made the point that we can't make recommendations to
16 the National Park Service about what we do on the
17 socioeconomic end. And so that really helped me to
18 differentiate the two issues.

19 MS. TRIBE: I thought along the same lines
20 last night. We've got mitigation measures that are related
21 to the alternatives, and I usually think of the word
22 "mitigation" associated with the engineering alternatives.
23 You're now calling the --

24 MS. TOWNSEND: Visitor development
25 strategies.

1 MS. TRIBE: -- and that goes to Dave's word
2 of "opportunities." Our job is not necessarily to tell the
3 Park how to do those; however, we may have a list of things
4 like that we would really like to see somebody follow
5 through with, regardless of what the Park's role is.

6 MS. STEWART: And I really think that Jean's
7 information is really going to become the Bible to us.

8 Thank you, Jean, that was absolutely great stuff.

9 MS. TOWNSEND: Thank you. But you
10 participated, so thank you.

11 MS. TRIBE: And as Joni is saying, those
12 things are going to be important, regardless of which
13 alternative is chosen. Thank you.

14 Don, please.

15 MR. WHITE: I guess, besides learning reports
16 of surveys, I get a perspective of what's happening. The
17 meeting that I learned yesterday kind of verified the fact
18 that this engineering study and what's happening at the
19 drainage stuff and its importance right now of maintenance
20 at this point, maintaining the roads, keeping things going
21 and that how you coordinate your maintenance with the
22 environmental, it seems like we need to start moving fast.
23 And it's pretty much verified we need to move. This road is
24 shifting every day. In talking to a lot of people, they
25 talk about You guys are sitting around with a couple-year

1 study. In the mean time, the road's falling down. But the
2 important thing, I think, is moving fast.

3 And another thing I learned is we have some rock
4 coming from Minnesota, and we have a lot of rock right in
5 this area that probably would fit the scene a lot better.

6 MS. TRIBE: So the idea of using native
7 Montana materials is important to you.

8 I think the other thing you really caused us to
9 think about, Don, is the business of operation and
10 maintenance, and the longer we wait the more deterioration
11 there is.

12 And someone asked Joe yesterday if we did some of
13 these rehab things now, because we have to, will that cut
14 down on the cost? And he said probably, because there will
15 be less to do; that that's just sort of logical that some of
16 it would come off. So we're going to have to really look at
17 operation and maintenance, in terms of chapter 5 today and
18 see how that supports everything we're doing. So thank you.

19 Suzann.

20 MS. LEWIS: Yesterday I think I took away
21 more my thoughts went to learning about this process, maybe
22 a little bit like Brian and Jayne. The public participation
23 process is something that's really important and how the
24 National Park Service reaches its decisions. And I think
25 yesterday, having been with this group now three times,

1 yesterday I think we showed that we're about ready to reach
2 our stride and how that public information we can best learn
3 from it in the Park Service best integrate it into what is
4 then a legal process, planning process we go through with
5 NEPA. That was sort of renewed and invigorated my feeling
6 we're finally getting to a point where we best understand
7 how to work these processes with the public, how to deal
8 with all the diversity of opinion that sits in this room.
9 It's not a question of seeking out the best opinion. The
10 question is opening the process enough to allow all opinions
11 and all values to be integrated in the process. So that's
12 what I learned yesterday.

13 MS. TRIBE: And as a decision maker, that's
14 got to be helpful, also, to understand how frustrating it
15 is, not just for people who are citizens, but we've got two
16 Canadian citizens sitting here saying Golly, we learn about
17 the process too. And the whole idea of how does NEPA follow
18 this is sometimes a difficult thing. So that's got to be
19 useful for you; thank you.

20 Randy, will you close this, please?

21 CHAIRMAN OGLE: My thoughts yesterday really
22 were two. First of all, that the overwhelming majority of
23 people think that we should get the road fixed and fixed as
24 rapidly as possible and not drag it out.

25 And secondly, that with the Park Service numbers

1 trending down and the data that came from Jean's surveys
2 indicating that the vast majority of people would still come
3 to the Park, despite some road work and disruption in
4 traffic across the road, I don't really think that there is
5 going to be an overwhelming impact on the number of people
6 that come here by the road work. So I thought that was
7 helpful.

8 MS. TRIBE: So it really helps us be able to
9 focus on our specific tasks that we have here. Because it
10 kind of pushes out some of the fear and what -- what we
11 don't want to do is dilute concerns to the point where we
12 say Oh, you shouldn't worry. That's got to be there. But
13 it really helps us be able to focus on what we have to do
14 here, because we're no longer fighting against it.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: The other thing I would
16 mention, in addition to those comments, is that I think
17 communication with the public is very crucial, but I think
18 that's a very resolvable problem. So that will help
19 mitigate the impacts on whether people will come or not. I
20 think it's very --

21 MS. TRIBE: Absolutely. And I hate to give
22 Barney credit again, because you know what you told me
23 yesterday, and look at Barbara. But as Barney said, the
24 more informed people are, the better problem solvers they
25 are. And the public -- we're part of their problem solving

1 as well.

2 Well, thank you very much. I appreciate sort of
3 the warm up and the revisit from what we did yesterday.

4 --o0o--

5 Ms. Tribe then asks Fred Babb to give an
6 explanation of some of the things that Joe Kracum was
7 referencing yesterday in his presentation relative to
8 drainage, et cetera.

9 Mr. Babb directs the Committee members to a
10 drawing in their packet entitled Some Rehabilitation Items.
11 It's the only cross-section of the road showing two cars
12 going across the road. This drawing was produced by Park
13 landscape architect, Jack Gordon.

14 Slope stability; that's the slope above the road
15 and below the road. So when we talk about slope stability,
16 that's what that means.

17 Everybody realizes what the road pavement is.
18 It's the traveling surface that vehicles go on.

19 The guard walls and retaining walls. That's where
20 there's a lot of confusion among people, not necessarily
21 this group. But the guard walls are the walls that are
22 above the road. And there's also guardrails that are talked
23 about also. But they're the two elements that are above the
24 pavement of the road.

25 Then you go to the features that are below the

1 road. On Jack's sketch, that shows retaining walls, arches,
2 anything like that that basically provide structural support
3 to the road.

4 And then the last elements like Joe said, one of
5 the biggest, if not the biggest on the road is drainage.
6 And that's basically the ditches, the culverts, the pipes,
7 anything that relates to carrying the water away from the
8 road or around the road. So they're the main features that
9 Joe was referring to yesterday and it is hopeful
10 Mr. Gordon's sketch helps a little bit and everybody
11 understands it.

12 MS. TRIBE: Any questions?

13 When you had the worksheet yesterday while we were
14 doing the public comment period, et cetera, I asked you, as
15 one of the questions on there, to think about the kind of
16 criteria that we ought to be using to evaluate or think
17 about priorities related to these proposed actions and other
18 things as well.

19 I'll ask the Committee to tell us about their
20 criteria first, and then we'll ask the contractors,
21 engineers as well, because they may have criteria that's
22 more technical, less social.

23 Why do you think we're going to do this criteria
24 exercise?

25 MS. BURCH: So we can rate the alternatives.

1 MS. TRIBE: So you can rate the proposed
2 actions as well as the alternatives.

3 What's another reason?

4 MS. PAHL: To some people, different things
5 have more meaning or value than others.

6 MS. TRIBE: That's right. And we're not
7 going to weigh the criteria. We're going to put them all up
8 here, but we want to make sure we know what's important to
9 each other.

10 Another reason?

11 MS. STEWART: For me, the criteria just
12 clarifies everything. It gives us a road map to where we're
13 going to go.

14 MS. TRIBE: Often when people -- laypeople
15 who are not technical experts identify criteria, they think
16 of criteria in more guiding principle terms, if you will.
17 These are the things we want to protect, these are the
18 things we want to make sure of. When the technical experts
19 do it, they're usually looking at criteria in terms of cost,
20 long-term success, meaning, it's not going to fail,
21 technical ease, things like how it all comes together,
22 integration.

23 So it will be interesting to see the difference
24 raised by the members and the engineers.

25 MR. O'QUINN: Gives us something to measure

1 against.

2 MS. TRIBE: Exactly. It gives us -- instead
3 of Barney saying I want it this way and Barbara saying No, I
4 want it this way, that way we get stuck in opinion rather
5 than fair --

6 MR. JEWETT: It's a framework for decision
7 making.

8 MS. TRIBE: So this is a process exercise
9 rather than a value exercise.

10 So what do you have out there for criteria on your
11 papers?

12 MR. BAKER: Well, like you said, how many
13 engineers are at the table here? Not very many of us. But
14 when you look on page 75 and 76, it looks, to me, like
15 that's pretty reasonable criteria to evaluate this project.

16 MS. TRIBE: How many are there?

17 MR. BAKER: Quite a few. And then they're
18 grouped on page 76. But this may not be the exact order,
19 but I think on page 75 it gives you the criteria that we
20 ought to be looking at.

21 MS. TRIBE: So the first thing I put up here,
22 pages 75 and 76. I'd like you to be reading through those
23 as you do the exercise this morning related to proposed
24 actions.

25 Are there any criteria that you have on your

1 papers that aren't listed there?

2 MS. BURCH: I have construction cost and
3 economic cost, separate items, and protection of the
4 resource -- protection of the road.

5 MS. TRIBE: So when you talk about economic
6 cost, you're talking to the communities, to those kinds of
7 things.

8 MS. BURCH: Right.

9 MS. TRIBE: So you would not want us to
10 immediately look at an alternative and say Now, that's the
11 cheapest one, so that's where we ought to go, without first
12 saying It's the cheapest, but the road will be closed for
13 four years.

14 MS. BURCH: Right.

15 MS. TRIBE: And the third one you said was...

16 MS. BURCH: Protect the road. We can spend
17 so much time massaging and balancing and discussing that we
18 let the road fall apart. So we need to balance all three of
19 those things.

20 MS. TRIBE: So when you say "protection of
21 the road," the way you just explained it, you're talking
22 about time. That if it takes us fifty years because we went
23 with Alternative 1, the road might fall apart because when
24 we get there --

25 MS. BURCH: I think so. But time would have

1 to be expanded to include time planning -- time's maybe just
2 a little limited. I mean, the whole stewardship aspect that
3 we should get out there and be doing the drainage. That's
4 not a criteria, though.

5 MS. TRIBE: I don't want to lose it. So if
6 you were evaluating those things by yourself, you would want
7 to look at which one would really cause us to be practicing
8 stewardship with the road.

9 MS. BURCH: Right.

10 MS. TRIBE: And that might be time, it might
11 be planning efforts, it might be all kinds of things.

12 MS. BURCH: Yeah; it's a big one.

13 MS. TRIBE: And this is sort of a guiding
14 principle kind of thing.

15 MS. PAHL: I'd like to reiterate what Susie
16 said, that we not lose sight of the road. If we lose the
17 road, the rest of this discussion doesn't matter. Then we
18 do have the cataclysmic that we don't think at this moment
19 we really need to have.

20 MS. TRIBE: So if 14 years from now we're
21 still talking about it --

22 MS. PAHL: And not doing anything, then we
23 really have failed.

24 But I would like to add to that, also, in terms of
25 my criteria, is to look at protecting those historic

1 features that are most at risk of being lost. Pieces of
2 guard wall that are original that, if they're not addressed
3 soon, they will fall down or fall over or will be lost in
4 the next avalanche. So the road is absolute. You don't
5 want to lose the big picture of the road, which is the
6 feature, but along the road are the historic features which
7 some are at higher risk than others.

8 MS. TRIBE: So if you were evaluating either
9 proposed actions or alternatives, this big picture is
10 important, but we also need to pay attention to those five
11 or three or seven areas that if we don't do something about
12 them, they're going to be gone.

13 MS. PAHL: I'm talking about the individual
14 historic features, like this guard wall.

15 MS. TRIBE: Exactly. And I'll add the word
16 "features" here.

17 Anything else?

18 MS. LEWIS: The one that I had written down
19 was one of the criteria I had because, again, I lacked the
20 technical knowledge associated with -- on the proposed
21 actions with the engineering was that of the proposed
22 actions, one of the criteria I'd use is can they be
23 communicated easily and understandably to the public? And
24 what my thoughts were going to is if -- how do we help the
25 public understand whatever actions are going on on the road,

1 that they understand that they are the most important
2 actions to be happening because of risk or because of need;
3 that we have to be able to communicate that to the
4 layperson.

5 MS. TRIBE: Okay. So is there something
6 that's going to be really hard to sell, and I'm using sale
7 in a very broad sense, that we might want to think about.

8 Anything else?

9 MR. JEWETT: I had a couple things. One I
10 had was this place in the efficiency of the completion. It
11 seems to me that we can't look at engineering criteria in
12 isolation with a lot of the other considerations that we're
13 looking at; time of season, visitor experience. So I think
14 that one of the criteria has to be how does it fit into the
15 overall strategic plan to build or to rehab the road?
16 What's the impact on visitor experience of a certain segment
17 being done at a certain time, and how does that weigh itself
18 against the risk of failure, cost, time of day, just one
19 example. It's hard to articulate in a few words, but I
20 think it's an important consideration.

21 The other criteria I had on engineering options
22 was that there needs to be consideration of not foreclosing
23 future road use options in taking engineering action.

24 MS. TRIBE: So the two things you've added
25 here, and this one really helps us think about Susie's

1 comments as well or criteria as well, what's the impact on
2 the visitor experience by segment? And by segment, meaning
3 drainage, walls, whatever. How is that going to be back to
4 this big economic sort of broader cost? And then might an
5 action foreclose future use options?

6 When I left Missoula, someone said to me, from a
7 school board that I'm working with, So where are you going?
8 So I said East Glacier. So what are you going to do there?
9 I said, I'm working with the Going-to-the-Sun Highway
10 Advisory Committee. And that person said Well, whatever
11 they do, don't let them stop my bicycle ride I do under the
12 moonlight every year. So I thought it was interesting how
13 many individual kinds of things there are out there.

14 So what you're saying is there may be things in
15 the future we haven't thought of, in terms of use. There
16 may be things in the future we haven't thought of, in terms
17 of being able to save parts of other things. And you just
18 want us to be aware of that.

19 MR. JEWETT: Right. And just to finish that
20 loop, there also may be engineering actions that we can take
21 right now that would reinforce future uses that are
22 important.

23 MS. TRIBE: So foreclose or reinforce.

24 MR. JEWETT: As an example, if it makes more
25 sense, from an engineering perspective, to have more mass

1 transit shuttle in order to build more quickly, and mass
2 transit shuttle becomes a preferred use in the future as
3 many people in the public had said, then that engineering
4 option should be integrated into those decisions.

5 MS. TRIBE: Sure. Or at least examined
6 within the analysis.

7 Anything else?

8 MR. JACKSON: I think that we have to kind of
9 evaluate them, in terms of are they realistic? For
10 instance, if the first one is a highest risk of catastrophic
11 loss, will we really be doing this for fifty years, as an
12 example. It may not be a realistic alternative. And then
13 the other one is there still has -- and I think it's kind of
14 pushing into this. We still have to worry about fairness,
15 and that's why we're, in fact, talking about mitigation and
16 those kinds of things. So that still creeps back into our
17 discussion of alternative in our own way.

18 MS. TRIBE: So sort of a beginning place, in
19 a lot of ways, is the basis of realism is especially if in
20 fifty years it won't matter.

21 And then is it fair, and I put "fair" in quotation
22 marks, because when I say to my kids the fair's in August,
23 so fair is a real hard thing to define. But it's one of
24 four senses of well-being factors for humans. You want to
25 cause issues, poke them in the fairness rib. So this is

1 sort of a subjective kind of criteria, but it's something we
2 really have to think about. Does this seem fair, in terms
3 of how the alternative's put together? If it was the one we
4 did, would it be perceived as a fair thing? That's not an
5 engineering criteria.

6 Anything else, Jayne?

7 MS. KREMENIK: As I was thinking about this
8 last night and coming up with criteria, I was trying to
9 think of it from the perspective of why I'm here, what our
10 perspective is, not being an engineer. And the two things I
11 was coming up with was access and safety and trying to
12 balance those two things. Like safety for the workers or
13 safety for the public as they travel.

14 But the reason that we're here, I believe, is that
15 we felt strongly that there should be access to the road
16 during construction and the road shouldn't be closed. I
17 think that was one of the reasons why the Committee got
18 started. So some type of balance there.

19 MS. TRIBE: So does a particular action or
20 alternative accommodate safety for whoever; the visitor, the
21 worker, and is that balanced with access opportunities?
22 That's an important reason, for example, for you, as a
23 Canadian representative, to be here.

24 Anything else?

25 Now, please, Roscoe?

1 MR. BLACK: Just a combination between
2 Suzanne's and David's, the practicality and the
3 communication. But we have to take it one more step in the
4 practicality of being able to sell this to the people on
5 roads appropriations or whatnot, on getting the funding out
6 of this particular issue. We can talk about all the beauty
7 and everything that we want to with this road, and somebody
8 says That's fine, but there isn't any money to do it so
9 where do we go from there?

10 MS. TRIBE: Absolutely. So can we sell it to
11 the funders, and "sell," again, in quotation marks. And we
12 might think of that in two ways. One is if we come in with
13 recommendations that are terribly expensive over what could
14 be done, then probably that's not going to fly. Should the
15 rest of the citizens pay for a particular area, economic
16 well-being? And second, if we come in with such a
17 convoluted set of alternatives, would any engineer be
18 willing to touch it? Because as Joe said yesterday to us,
19 we tried to move out of the box a little bit, we tried to
20 push it a little bit, but at the same time, we have to be
21 practical and that's the word that you're using, Roscoe,
22 whether you're talking about money or engineering.

23 Anna Marie.

24 MS. MOE: I think we have to look at the
25 longevity of it. I mean, we don't want to be back here in

1 10 years, you know, having to fix it and we're back here
2 trying to fix it again. And along with that is, it needs to
3 be low maintenance. I mean, they fixed some of the stuff in
4 the '90s, and they're having problems with it because they
5 haven't been able to maintain it. So I mean, we have to
6 have something that doesn't cost a lot to maintain.

7 MS. TRIBE: So two that I've added, is it a
8 long-term solution, meaning that it's going to hold, we're
9 not going to have to go back in and that -- it was smart
10 that we didn't do something, and then Holy smoke, cars can't
11 get around that bend or -- I'm teasing. I know engineers
12 wouldn't do that. But pardon me for insulting you so early
13 in the morning. So the second one, what will be the
14 maintenance cost. Will it cost so much to maintain that
15 it's not worth it? And cost, also, in terms of how often do
16 we have to be there? You used the term "low maintenance";
17 thanks.

18 Tom?

19 MR. MCDONALD: Well, thinking about what Tony
20 said, you know, limiting future options, I see this as kind
21 of a demonstration project. Yesterday in the comment period
22 when Philip Crissman was talking about the intentional
23 enhancement of the highway, and then when Joe was talking
24 about if we can do most of these actions, 90 percent of
25 them, I believe, allowing one-way traffic or one lane at a

1 time, and Brian mentioned the possibility of a one-way loop,
2 well, is that possible in this analysis to bring in the
3 one-way and it will be a demonstration project for the
4 future? There wouldn't be delays on a one-way flow system
5 with single-lane traffic open. But it might, you know, show
6 that people enjoy the visit better by not having to worry
7 about two-lane traffic. It hits a lot of options that
8 people have talked about for increasing visitation for this
9 area, enhancing other routes, enhancing interpretation of
10 the Park.

11 MS. TRIBE: So, Tom, might it allow us to
12 analyze future traffic planning because we're making the
13 visitor do it this way now, could we get some information,
14 could we see how that works? You used the one-way loop as
15 an example. But also thinking about other routes, all kinds
16 of things. So might it be a model that allows us to explore
17 opportunities, just because we get to practice a couple of
18 things while the road's torn up.

19 Suzann.

20 MS. LEWIS: I'd add one more paper reference,
21 under the first one of pages 75 and 76 of the engineering
22 study. Also page 3 of the green Draft Project Agreement in
23 your packages, on page 3 and the top of page 4 are the five
24 criteria that this Committee agreed to and endorsed at the
25 very first meeting. So that would be another reference for

1 you.

2 MS. TRIBE: Okay.

3 Well, if Barney was sitting in some kind of a
4 planning meeting and they were doing criteria, this is
5 probably not exactly how they'd look.

6 But the reason I wanted to do this exercise,
7 partly, is because, as Barbara said earlier, we want to hear
8 the interests that everybody brings. And boy, they really
9 speak loudly when we do this kind of exercise. So again, be
10 sure to look at pages 75 and 76 in the Engineering Study,
11 because those are the things the engineers suggest, pages 3
12 and 4 of that Project Agreement, the green page, because
13 those are sort of the Committee broad umbrella areas.

14 We want you to think about, Is it affordable? How
15 will it impact the local community, in economic costs as
16 well as others? Will it lead to the long-term protection of
17 the road and will it be done fast enough that the road is
18 protected? Will it look like stewardship as we're going
19 through the process as well as the result? Might it allow
20 us to model or practice some things that we could think
21 about as future sort of Park management options? Does it
22 accommodate the ability to look at those particular places
23 that are of highest risk? And we're not talking a segment,
24 necessarily. We could be talking about one stone wall. Can
25 the proposed actions be communicated accurately, thoroughly,

1 understandably to the public? What might be the impact on
2 the visitor experience by particular segment and element?
3 And that's really important when we're talking about the
4 proposed actions. Might an action either foreclose or
5 perhaps reinforce future use options? Is a particular
6 action or alternative realistic? Will there be a sense of
7 fairness? Does it accommodate safety for whoever we need to
8 be safe? And can we balance that with opportunity for
9 access? Can we sell this to the funders, and would the
10 engineers say This is not an engineering alternative, this
11 is a home-ec alternative? We need to -- and I don't want to
12 offend anyone in here, because my degree happens to be in
13 home economics and history and political science, and I
14 don't want anybody to be laughing about that. Is it a
15 long-term solution rather than short-term fix? And will it
16 be low maintenance, or will it be something like my third
17 child, that you have to pay a lot of attention to a lot of
18 the time and it costs a lot of money? He's in the Coast
19 Guard now. All right.

20 So I would like you to take those pieces of paper
21 that you had yesterday, they have a little colored check
22 mark. I want you to group yourselves according to those
23 colored check marks, and it's random because I believe in
24 randomness. You've got two minutes to group yourselves.

25 Review the chart on page 38, just because that's a

1 starting place, in terms of thinking of those elements in
2 the proposed actions. Each of the five groups gets one of
3 the elements. So look at all four segments of the road as
4 in that chart, and look at the element that's assigned to
5 the group, for example, drainage.

6 Using the criteria, I want each group to discuss
7 why they agree or disagree with the priorities as the
8 engineers have laid them out in the report, and then, based
9 on your discussion, propose any changes or affirm them.
10 Then develop draft recommendations related to that chart and
11 document them on a flip chart. We've got five flip charts,
12 so somebody from each group can grab one.

13 Develop any additional advice you feel is
14 important related to your element. Now, again, using
15 Barbara's example of yesterday and Don's comment this
16 morning and Tom's about using native rock, this is the place
17 to say those kinds of things. So any additional advice
18 about guard walls, about whatever thing is assigned to you.
19 And then look at chapter five in the engineering report,
20 which is the Proposed Operations and Maintenance Plan, and
21 propose any advice related to that, but to seriously think
22 about the proposed action as it relates to operations and
23 maintenance and then be prepared to present your draft
24 recommendations to the large group.

25 The reason facilitators do large group, small

1 group work is not just to move people around, but in a group
2 of 16 people, we'll be all day talking through thing by
3 thing. So in each small group, they're being asked to do
4 staff work for the large group. So a lot of analysis is
5 already behind the recommendations, and it moves things
6 along.

7 MR. O'QUINN: Could I ask you a couple
8 questions along this? Where are we headed? What is the
9 objective we're trying to get to? Because I have got
10 overall concerns I'd like to address with regard to the
11 alternatives in general, not specific fine tuning of things.
12 And it seems what we're headed to is fine tuning the
13 alternatives and accepting, and I'm not sure where we're
14 headed.

15 MS. TRIBE: Let me offer where I think we're
16 headed, and we'll see if that's okay. When we planned the
17 session, we talked about the importance of people
18 understanding these sort of specific kinds of things related
19 to alternatives, before we talk about the alternatives. And
20 so while you may be doing some fine tuning here, in terms of
21 who you agree with the priorities and also how might members
22 of the Committee see some things happening related to those
23 proposed actions, when we get to alternatives, which is the
24 next exercise, we will have the opportunity to comment on
25 them, restructure, make new ones, do whatever. So you all

1 right?

2 MR. O'QUINN: Yeah.

3 MS. TRIBE: So it's about nine o'clock right
4 now. I'd like to see if you could be finished with this and
5 you've got it on flip chart paper no later than quarter to
6 10:00. Can you do it in 45 minutes?

7 The assignments are: The green group does
8 drainage, all the segments; red group, does slope stability;
9 brown group does retaining walls, arches, tunnels,
10 et cetera; blue group, guard walls; purple group, roadway
11 pavement.

12 (Whereupon, at 9:05 a.m. the small groups commence
13 their discussions, and at 10:10 a.m. their conclusions are
14 presented.)

15 MS. TRIBE: If it's all right, could we start
16 with drainage? That's the green group.

17 MR. JEWETT: Green group. We had drainage.
18 We went about our tasks methodically. Task A, review the
19 chart on page 38. I want everybody to know that we all
20 looked at the chart, agreed that there were five numbers in
21 the chart, five categories and moved on.

22 So we rock. Task A accomplished.

23 Let me preface what's on here very quickly with
24 that we generally felt, as a group, that we were not capable
25 of answering a lot of these questions, frankly. We're not

1 engineers, and in some ways coming at these questions as
2 laypeople, we didn't really think we could add a tremendous
3 amount of value to the engineering discussion. But we
4 forged on anyway, and this is what we have for task B, which
5 is Using the list of criteria, discuss why you agree or
6 disagree with the priorities on the chart. We went and
7 asked Joe what criteria were used to create the chart, and
8 Joe's answer was what we had suspected, which was that the
9 criteria, the main criteria, was need to rehab. And so we
10 said, number 1, we accept the rankings for drainage based on
11 the need to rehab. Because we're not going to question the
12 engineer's conclusion on that, because we're not capable of
13 doing that.

14 However, in order to be true to our task,
15 Virginia, which was using our criteria, we also want to say
16 that the criteria that the group listed might alter the
17 rankings based upon how they would be integrated into the
18 engineering decisions. But we didn't have the time or the
19 complete data or consensus from the group on what -- what
20 importance those criteria were in our consensus for
21 two-thirds minor views to really say to this group how we
22 would change the rankings. Got it?

23 MS. TRIBE: So Tony, you're saying that
24 basically since you're not engineers, you accept the ranking
25 that's there. However, because of some of the perhaps more

1 socioeconomic kind of criteria, when they put together the
2 design that Joe referred to yesterday, maybe those rankings
3 would change, when you had to think about traffic management
4 and all those kinds of things.

5 MR. JEWETT: Right.

6 MS. TRIBE: But you don't have the
7 information to do it.

8 MR. JEWETT: No. We don't have a consensus
9 from the group as to what is most important in the areas
10 listed. Certainly, the issue of maybe there should be a
11 drop dead criteria which may be beyond which no other
12 criteria would count, such as imminent failure. But we do
13 think that if, in fact, the plan of this read that if the
14 exercise we went through has any value of ever lasting -- or
15 just something we did to fill time, that they ought to look
16 at it to agree on what's important, what's not, and use it
17 in a sophisticated way.

18 C, draft recommendations related to the chart on
19 page 38. We didn't have anything on that. We didn't see
20 any reason to change that, frankly.

21 D, develop any additional advice you feel is
22 important related to your element. We had two things.
23 Number 1, drainage is the foundation for road permanency.
24 As drainage goes, so goes the road. Therefore, we think
25 drainage needs to be really elevated, in terms of the five

1 elements.

2 Secondly, our advice would be you really need to
3 get in there and get -- there's reference in the documents
4 about the fact that core sampling hasn't been done and,
5 therefore, there's not enough information. We really felt
6 that needed to get done right away so we had information to
7 either affirm or not affirm the rankings.

8 E, advice for operations and maintenance. Because
9 as drainage goes, so goes the road, we felt, number 1, that
10 the drainage system should be built not to prudent standards
11 but to the highest possible standards. And as Susie said,
12 Make it as close to auto-maintenance as possible.

13 And the second piece of advice was to -- the
14 history of this thing is that the Park has not had the money
15 to maintain any of these systems. And so our advice would
16 be to seek rehab methods and designs that result in low
17 maintenance cost or ongoing maintenance.

18 And number E was be prepared to discuss your
19 group, and we did.

20 MS. TRIBE: Any problems with their
21 recommendations? Nice job.

22 Let's go second, then, to slope stability, the red
23 group. And is your flip chart up here?

24 MR. MEZNARICH: As Tony mentioned, general
25 operations was what we were able to come up with. Regarding

1 the first task, using our list of criteria, look at those
2 priorities, determine whether we agree or disagree. And we
3 agree, eh? Which is indicative of the international flavor
4 of the red group.

5 And we felt that it was quite obvious in three of
6 the road segments between the West Tunnel and Bearing Creek,
7 we had a little discussion there. But it seems that that
8 was appropriate as well.

9 Item C, draft recommendations. We decided to
10 focus on the most critical elements. First, safety being
11 the major concern, that that would supersede other items and
12 that a combination here in item 3, that increased capital
13 costs are justified, if they reduce future maintenance
14 costs. That we wouldn't shortcut the initial costs at the
15 cost of future maintenance, since that has been such a
16 critical issue. And Tony mentioned it in the drainage as
17 well. And we need to provide for that.

18 D, develop any additional advice. We don't want
19 to lose other road segments because of a focus on the alpine
20 section. It was the first priority, but we understand and
21 want to reiterate that if there's a bridge that's at risk of
22 failing in the Bearing Creek section, that it is not set
23 aside until the entire alpine section is completed; that
24 those various features be prioritized as well, regardless of
25 what segment of the road they're in. And that we had

1 concerns based on access to funding. We assume that the
2 alpine section, while we agree with the priority, will also
3 be the most expensive to fix. And we had a concern that
4 given the length of time that would be involved in the
5 overall project, that perhaps there would be too much of a
6 focus on the alpine section at the potential cost of the
7 other road segments in the future; that the contracts would
8 be let independently, and that once the alpine section was
9 complete, there may be a greater obstacle to receive funding
10 for the lower sections of the road.

11 E, list any advice relative to the proposal, that
12 all items be considered and balanced. For example, we can't
13 do something regarding slope stability that may be
14 detrimental to drainage or one of the other items. We don't
15 think that native rock collection and additional pullout
16 creation is a good enough reason to remove rock overhangs
17 which contribute to the historical and aesthetic experience
18 of the road. So we don't want to allow that to be an
19 opportunity to change the historical features.

20 MR. O'QUINN: Say that last thing again.

21 MR. MEZNARICH: We had a discussion about
22 scaling and the potential for removing rocks from up above,
23 that we wouldn't use that as an excuse to create additional
24 pullouts by removing a tremendous amount of rock.

25 MR. O'QUINN: Oh, okay.

1 MR. MEZNARICH: But merely use that, again,
2 safety being first, using that element not to just produce
3 more raw material or to create pullouts, because those
4 pullouts would be on the interior of the road and create a
5 safety issue with pedestrians crossing to see the vistas.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. TRIBE: Well, if there aren't any
8 disagreements, we'll move on to the third one, and that's
9 the brown group; retaining walls, arches and tunnels.

10 Did you have a spokesperson?

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: For B we agreed with the
12 prioritization from page 38.

13 Our category was rehabilitation of retaining
14 walls, arches and tunnels. And you'll notice a section in
15 the books on pages 90 to 96 that talks about rehabilitation
16 of retaining walls, arches and tunnels. And we agreed with
17 that section.

18 First of all, there's a few specific things that
19 we got that are in that section that should be noted. First
20 of all, there are five priority retaining walls, right now,
21 that are on the rehabilitation list that are in dire need of
22 rehabilitation, as soon as possible. We agree with that and
23 think those should be prioritized and done as soon as
24 possible.

25 We also mentioned in there that, obviously,

1 retaining wall work has to be completed before work above
2 the retaining wall, such as pavement and guard walls. And
3 of course, suggest preservation of the historic character as
4 much as practical, that's the word used in those pages, and
5 suggest using native materials as much as possible in this
6 rehabilitation work.

7 Now, you'll note in those pages, if you recall or
8 if you're looking at them, that the first -- first of all,
9 the consultants recommended utilization of the
10 rehabilitation on the retaining walls that is recommended by
11 the Federal Highway Administration. And that process
12 includes the shooting of concrete in for stabilization and
13 then tying into the concrete and then facing it with native
14 materials. And we think -- you know, we're not engineers,
15 but we think that that seems like an appropriate way to do
16 it. Obviously, there's a little deviation from the way the
17 road was originally built, but it seems to be the
18 appropriate thing to do.

19 We agreed with the drainage and slope stability
20 recommendations in the engineering study, under D.

21 And under E, we had a suggestion with regard to
22 operations and maintenance that we think at least should be
23 considered by the Park Service in deciding what to do with
24 operation and maintenance. And this is borne out of the
25 continual emphasis, in all of our studies, that drainage is

1 one of the biggest problems on the road. And this is a
2 high-maintenance road. Drainage will always be a problem,
3 given the terrain that this road goes over, and also borne
4 out of the belief, by our group, that maintenance is one of
5 the first things to go when budgets get cut. And,
6 therefore, we think that a long-term endowment fund or
7 reserve account should be established exclusively for
8 maintenance, separate from the Park Service budget; cannot
9 be used for any other purposes but maintenance. The Park
10 Service has no discretion to use it over -- for anything but
11 maintenance, and that only the income from that fund would
12 be used for maintaining the road. The fund would stay
13 intact perpetually.

14 The specifics of that would have to be worked out.
15 I think they're probably doable. Could be generated. We
16 suggested generating this -- when the request for funds for
17 the road are made by the Park Service, suggest going in and
18 requesting a 10-year maintenance program budget initially,
19 and build that into the budget, and then over the course of
20 those 10 years, be building this endowment fund that we
21 recommend. And that might be from a combination of sources;
22 maybe public funds, maybe nonprofit funds, maybe a fee from
23 the Park or something of that nature devoted to this fund so
24 that at the end of the 10-year period, the amount of money
25 that is targeted as the goal for the funds would be there.

1 And then after that, maintenance monies would always be
2 there to maintain this road.

3 It's a novel idea. I don't know how feasible it
4 is. But given the fact that drainage is such a serious
5 problem, and given the fact that we think, at least in our
6 group, which by the way was Brian and Joni and myself, that
7 it's something that is really seriously needed and that
8 needs kind of a novel approach. So that, I think, concludes
9 our report. Anything either of you want to add? So those
10 are our thoughts.

11 (Applause.)

12 MS. TRIBE: Don't you have a Glacier
13 foundation?

14 MR. BAKER: This would be a separate fund.

15 MS. TRIBE: I'm trying to think of the
16 organization.

17 FROM THE FLOOR: Glacier Fund.

18 MS. TRIBE: So this could even be a place
19 where you could ask them, like a hospital foundation, to put
20 this on their priority list for fund-raising and that kind
21 of business. Okay; nice job.

22 Well, let's go to the fourth group, if we could,
23 and that's the blue group. And they had guard walls. We
24 hope they're still here.

25 MS. PAHL: As if we could leave. Members of

1 the blue group, please rise.

2 MR. MEZNARICH: That group doesn't look real
3 random.

4 MS. PAHL: I'll tell you right now, and I
5 don't want to sound like a suck up, but the reason why these
6 conversations are going pretty well is because the report is
7 so -- it's all there. I mean, all the recommendations we're
8 talking about are there. They're easy to find. And so I
9 must refer you to pages 97 to 100 in your Engineering
10 Report, and that discusses guard walls. So it makes
11 us -- you know, this is really not brain surgery. It's not
12 even highway engineering for nonengineers.

13 So the answer to the first question is sure, you
14 know, we're not.

15 MR. O'QUINN: If we're not engineers.

16 MS. PAHL: Anyway, we agree with the
17 recommendations. We're not in the position, although Barney
18 is, and even Barney agreed that the priorities that you
19 identified looked good.

20 Just some notes to the alpine section clause. The
21 areas where the walls are most needed for safety and they're
22 the most deteriorated. And the least of our problems,
23 although you didn't agree with us, Roscoe, in the St. Mary
24 area was ranked lowest, and that seemed to make sense with
25 us. So we agree with your priorities.

1 The recommendations, we have a couple of
2 recommendations to make. One is that the historic walls
3 that remain are both repaired and replaced using compatible
4 stone. And we kind have of have an order of priority of
5 where they might come from. So -- though they're not shown.
6 Follow my letters, not my order. For finding the stone
7 would be to first collect and salvage stone either along the
8 road or fell down using a slusher, which, actually -- it's a
9 piece of mining equipment using in mining to gather up the
10 rock after you blow the face in the mine. It's a perfectly
11 wonderful device that can be used to scoop up and recover
12 rock that perhaps fell off the road. First priority would
13 be to find that rock.

14 Second, would be to -- from the scaling that is
15 determined to be done for safety issues, that that would be
16 another source of rock. That is, without trying to actually
17 try to quarry rock in the Park, which we understand would be
18 prohibited by Park Service regulations. However, if there's
19 scaling done, that that would be another good source of
20 rock. And we understand that up to maybe 70 percent of the
21 material needed could come from that source.

22 And then finally, we know that there's
23 opportunities to find compatible native rock, both on the
24 Blackfeet reservation and perhaps on the Confederated
25 Salish/Kootenai reservation. And that language is to

1 explore opportunities to obtain building materials from both
2 reservations, as opposed to having the tribes assume that
3 the federal government's just going to come in and go
4 looking after those quarries, which I understand there was a
5 little problem with over on the Flathead Reservation. So
6 those are our recommendations on where to find the material.

7 In the areas where the historic wall is gone, we
8 talked a bit, and we invited Mark to participate in this
9 discussion. There's a preservation philosophy about when
10 something is gone and missing, you have two choices. You
11 can either restore what was there, or you can put something
12 in that's modern that's compatible with the old and, in that
13 way, the visitor can differentiate the old from the new.
14 And both of them are legitimate choices. However, when you
15 have material, you have information, you have the research
16 that you could use to back up a restoration plan, and
17 because this is a national historic landmark, we really
18 would recommend the restoration plan as opposed to the
19 modern, though compatible.

20 In doing the restoration, what we're after is the
21 appearance of the old. So we still encourage you to use the
22 modern materials, especially in the places where you have
23 the avalanche issues, so that the wall will stay there and
24 remain. So to use the modern materials, make sure that the
25 appearance follows the historic wall that was there. And,

1 again, I think we can credit that fabulous historic
2 landscape study that provides so much historic documentation
3 that so often doesn't exist like this that can be your guide
4 on the wall that was there. And whether it was random or
5 rubble, to help you with those choices.

6 Finally, we did talk a bit about dealing with the
7 18-inch factor, which is what the walls were historically.
8 And of course, that does address the safety issues. And
9 what we'd recommend is rather than building back to the 18
10 inches, we recommend -- we would prefer that you bring the
11 road surface down to provide the 18 inches, but leave
12 flexibility there in areas where that's just not doable. So
13 this is merely a recommendation for you to use your
14 discretion, but that would be our preference.

15 And then finally, on operations and maintenance,
16 we really agree with the group that came before us that the
17 idea -- I think it's wrong even for this Committee to have
18 the assumption and put forward the assumption to Congress or
19 anybody else that we're going to fix the road and walk away
20 for 10 years, 20 years and call the job done. This road
21 requires regular, annual maintenance.

22 The National Park Service's five billion dollar
23 deferred maintenance problem didn't happen by accident. It
24 happened because maintenance was not addressed for too many
25 years. So we want to encourage -- and I like the idea of

1 the group that came before us -- on creating some sort of
2 maintenance fund. I like the idea of going to Congress
3 right out of the box and ask for funding for maintenance
4 programs. That needs to be a regular, ongoing part of how
5 that road is dealt with today and for everybody into the
6 future. It took a long time to build the road, and I think
7 it really requires regular and annual maintenance.

8 To that end, we would like to make sure that snow
9 removal, as we've been told, is no longer out there wrecking
10 the wall. And that's what we've been told. And we hope
11 that continues and that that becomes a very important key
12 component of the snow removal problem. Barney raised the
13 issue because he's worked on these roads in the east, that
14 there's a lack of craftsmen out there. There's a lack of
15 good masons to help with building the walls, rebuilding the
16 walls, and this might be a terrific opportunity to create
17 jobs for members of the tribes, members of the surrounding
18 counties where wages are low, unemployment is high, to train
19 those people to become stone masons and create job
20 opportunities for, as I said, tribal members, but others as
21 well who could work here and elsewhere with this skill.
22 There are few craftsmen left out there. We need to bring
23 those folks in and create opportunities for them to learn
24 these skills. So there you go.

25 (Applause.)

1 MS. TRIBE: And, again, I'd remind you that
2 Barbara and Barney were both in the same group.

3 Could we go to the last group? And the last group
4 is the purple group. And their assignment was roadway
5 pavement.

6 MR. DAKIN: We were quite aware at the very
7 beginning that we probably had the easiest of the five
8 categories. Which, considering that the purple group was
9 the intellectual power of the Committee, was lowered to
10 purple, we assumed that we were saved for something else.

11 But we certainly did agree the Advisory Committee
12 should recommend to the National Park Service to proceed
13 with the rehab needs by road segment, as depicted on page
14 38, figure 30, with regards to roadway pavement.

15 However, we did not find -- we were not able to
16 quite grasp, based on our reading of the material, quite
17 what the distinction was between priority 4 and priority 5;
18 Lake McDonald section versus the St. Mary's section. And I
19 think we could come back to that.

20 We did have a couple pieces of additional advice:
21 That the Park Service might consider restoring more suitable
22 pavement width to accommodate oversized vehicles within
23 those areas that are not subject to vehicle-length
24 restrictions. The concern being that the overlays that were
25 done at the St. Mary and the Lake McDonald ends actually

1 narrowed the driving surface a little bit. And it's very
2 obvious that when people pull trailers, the trailers go off
3 the edge of the pavement and rut it out.

4 We return to our discomfort with the distinction
5 between priority 4 and 5. Here, clearly distinguish the
6 priority designations; the reasons for the priority
7 designation between the Lake McDonald section and the
8 St. Mary section. And if that distinction is not clear,
9 then attribute equal priority to both of those recently
10 reconstructed pavement sections. We just felt that, again,
11 the priority being we need to be able to explain very well
12 to the public how these priorities were obtained. And if we
13 didn't quite understand how they were obtained, maybe that
14 needed to be a little bit more addressed in the future work.

15 Operations and maintenance. I think we -- this,
16 of course, is the thing that I read probably the most
17 closely, because of my experience of having been a Park guy.

18 Like the blue group, like the brown group, we did
19 wrestle with the fact that, as funds diminish, work gets
20 deferred, and that's how you get to the problems such as we
21 have today.

22 We do find that the -- this is, I guess,
23 particularly my concern, that the historic maintenance
24 practice in the engineering report is not wholesale
25 accurate. We would like to have the Park Service, when it

1 deals with these documents in the future levels of analysis,
2 look more at the history section in the cultural landscape
3 report, which we feel is much more accurate. There's some
4 dates in there that just simply don't match up with reality.
5 And that was the essence of this piece of advice.

6 The National Park Service to develop and improve
7 maintenance and operating plan after the rehab that ensures
8 future maintenance operating funds that go in the ground
9 rather than overhead. This little 8-page maintenance plan
10 that is in here is pretty low level. It made us feel that
11 there was -- that whatever effort has been expended at this
12 point, seems to be directed more toward finding more people
13 to think about work and priorities work and budget work than
14 to actually do the work. And we would hate to see the
15 increased level of maintenance funds that this whole
16 Committee has agreed needs to be pursued, end up just
17 bureaucratizing the maintenance division, instead of putting
18 more people out there to clean culverts.

19 Can you add anything more? This was Suzann and
20 Don and Roscoe. Thanks.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. TRIBE: I'd like to ask Joe, as the
23 person who's sort of standing up there in front, in terms of
24 the engineering report, is this helpful? How will it be
25 useful for you?

1 MR. KRACUM: Well, sure; a couple of things.
2 One, there's some job openings for people that have a really
3 good grasp on what the issues are. And I think what I have
4 come back with, and it's a point that we've been trying to
5 make from the get-go, is that drainage and maintenance and
6 operations are the keys to making this work, both now,
7 during the rehab and after the rehab. And so I applaud you,
8 because that is one of the main keys of this whole thing.

9 The advice looks real good. I think there's some
10 issues there that could be carried forward. I really think
11 they look really good. And I had one more comment, but it
12 seems to have lost me or I've lost it. But --

13 MS. TRIBE: Maybe it will come to you.

14 MR. KRACUM: Maybe it will come to me.

15 Oh, I got it; yeah.

16 When we spent time on the road, one of the things
17 that we also looked at was How do we actually contract this
18 work out? What does a package for a year look like? And
19 one of the things that we came up with that we feel pretty
20 strong about, we have these priorities. And in this chart,
21 page 38, it's a general categorization. You've got to
22 realize there's hundreds of these sites that flow into that,
23 so it's a very general categorization. One of the things
24 that we thought of that would make a lot of sense is when we
25 package a year's contract, that we include work both in the

1 alpine section and in the lower sections in the same types
2 of contracts. And one of the reasons for that is because of
3 the unknown weather conditions at the beginning of the
4 season. We may not get to the alpine section, but we still
5 want to get some work done. We want to utilize that time in
6 the early part of the season as well as the later part of
7 the season. So it gives some flexibility to the contractor,
8 in terms of work areas. With that also comes, you know, if
9 you have an extended snow season, to get good value from the
10 contractor, you need to keep the people working. So having
11 these multiple sites, both at lower sections and at the
12 higher sections, make a lot of sense from a construction
13 value standpoint.

14 MS. TRIBE: And that supports the concern of
15 having more than one segment worked on at a time.

16 Joe, thanks very much.

17 Tony, do you have a closing comment before we
18 bring this part to close?

19 MR. JEWETT: No.

20 MS. TRIBE: Now, one of the things that I'm
21 going to do, not after each exercise but at the end, I'm
22 going to ask the Advisory group to tell both the Park
23 Service and the contractors what they would expect to see
24 now; you know, what do they want to have happen with these
25 things. So I would like the Committee to be thinking about

1 that.

2 Joe said this gives us additional stuff to look
3 at. It may help form some of the alternatives, it gives
4 some parameters, it affirms some things we're already
5 thinking, a whole bunch of stuff. But I want you to be
6 thinking, as one of the closing pieces of information you'll
7 give both to the Park Service and to the contractors, in
8 real terms, in pretty specific ways, what do you expect them
9 to do with the information, and how will you measure whether
10 they have thought about what you said in your
11 recommendations. So I really appreciate the work that you
12 did this morning.

13 We're moving into the alternatives, and they will
14 be a lot more painful.

15 --o0o--

16 Ms. Tribe would like the Committee to get started
17 on the alternative exercise, finish by 3:30 this afternoon
18 so the mitigation can be accomplished and finished by 6:00.
19 She then recommends a five-minute stretch for the group.

20 (Proceedings in recess from 10:45 a.m. to
21 10:50 a.m.)

22 Ms. Tribe directs the Committee members to regroup
23 as they were and then to switch out one or two members of
24 each group into another group for the next exercise. They
25 will be able work on this next task until the public comment

1 period from 11:30 to 12:30, then have lunch, and be prepared
2 to give their presentations at 1:30.

3 MS. TRIBE: Your tasks are: Review the
4 alternative assigned to your group.

5 Using our criteria, how does this alternative meet
6 or not meet the criteria? How could this alternative be
7 improved to make it more acceptable? Now, remember, our job
8 here is not to pick the number 1 alternative. We don't have
9 that power. Our job here is to recommend acceptable
10 alternatives that you think are okay to go forward. They're
11 sound enough that they should go forward for future analysis
12 in the environmental document.

13 C, draft recommendations related to this
14 alternative and document them on the flip chart. Include in
15 those, in its current form or based on your suggestions for
16 improvement, Do you think this -- tell us if you think this
17 is an alternative that should go forward, and what advice do
18 you have related to traffic management and this alternative.

19 D, please list common elements you think should be
20 in every alternative.

21 E, is there another alternative or alternative
22 approach that should be considered? And if you have time to
23 do a little structuring on that, go for it.

24 And then be prepared to present it to the
25 group -- ready to present at 1:30. But within that time

1 frame, we've got lunch and a public comment period, some of
2 which will be available for your work.

3 MR. MEZNARICH: So that's only about 45
4 minutes.

5 MS. TRIBE: This group would get Alternative
6 1; this group will do Alternative 3. This group will do
7 Alternative 2; this group will do Alternative 5, and this
8 group will do Alternative 4.

9 (Whereupon at 10:55 a.m. the small groups commence
10 their discussions. There is no public comment given between
11 11:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m.; lunch is taken, and at 1:15 p.m.
12 the groups are called back to order by Ms. Tribe.)

13 MS. TRIBE: Let's start with Alternative 1.
14 Let's see if we can limit the presentations to about
15 five -- between five and 10 minutes, depending on everything
16 you have to say, and then we'll try to work through the
17 discussion and the coming to agreement so that we are no
18 later than the three o'clock time. But we might be able to
19 beat that, depending on the discussion.

20 MR. JEWETT: I'd like to spend a few minutes
21 so I understand the process that we're going through. This
22 morning, when we went through this exercise what we've come
23 up with we basically were done and moved on, which is fine
24 with me. We are engaged now in a process, from my view, in
25 deciding whether or not these alternatives are adequate to

1 these perspectives. To me, that is a discussion that needs
2 much more inclusion than before.

3 MS. TRIBE: Absolutely. This morning I said
4 What do you think? Are there any comments? I'm expecting
5 they would be far different with these. And what I'd like
6 to be able to do, as we go through each one, is either
7 dismiss it, keep it with, keep it with new parts to it, and
8 also add additional alternatives that are recommended, and
9 then, by the end of the discussion, decide the full amount;
10 what are we recommending going forward as alternatives.

11 MR. JEWETT: Great.

12 MS. TRIBE: Again, could we ask the people
13 with Alternative 1.

14 MR. DAKIN: Well, the purple group that did
15 pavement this morning then got Alternative 1. So we didn't
16 really have a lot of cerebral wear and tear. And I think we
17 could go through this fairly quickly.

18 Using the repair as needed alternative, we
19 compared it to the criteria. Does it meet criteria such as
20 engineering design, historic preservation? Those criteria
21 that we felt it met, it met very minimally.

22 Design, obviously, does not meet. Because we have
23 no opportunity, then, to do comprehensive planning and
24 affect standards. Historic preservation, the review, even
25 though it would happen every year, as they got to the

1 project that was most urgent for that year, it would be very
2 piecemeal. It would not be overall theme.

3 Construction techniques, there would be a lack of
4 overall project planning that could lead to inefficient
5 accomplishment and management. It's obviously reactive, not
6 proactive. You waste money. You have a lack of the big
7 picture, of how all the elements fit together.

8 Material handling, very inefficient. You may not
9 even have the same contractor year after year. Everybody
10 starts over every year. Cost ineffective. A very minimal
11 result, in terms of all the start-up and take-down at the
12 end of the season.

13 Does it lend itself to long-term maintenance? And
14 our answer to that is No, it is maintenance. That's all it
15 is, Alternative 1.

16 Traffic versus visitor management; it's going to
17 take 50 years. There's an annual disruption of visitor
18 traffic. Glacier Park will be known as the under
19 construction endlessly torn up place. People will avoid it.
20 It presents a negative image for the Park. Risk management;
21 it's very unacceptable because of the high risk for
22 catastrophic failure, and that public safety is the least
23 safeguarded under that alternative.

24 How can Alternative 1 be made more acceptable? We
25 don't believe it can be. It's too late. You can never hope

1 to catch up if you're dealing with a 2 or 3 million dollar
2 year allowance. If you had started Alternative 1 maybe 15
3 or 20 years ago, maybe it could have been a viable thing to
4 think about. This is almost the Do Nothing Alternative in
5 an EIS. I'm not sure -- yeah.

6 If you did the planning, how could you make it
7 acceptable? You would do it by doing it -- being able to
8 plan it. Well then, you're in Alternative 2. So
9 Alternative 1 is not amenable to any of that.

10 Is this an acceptable alternative? No.

11 Common elements for all alternatives: We need to
12 make sure that all the alternatives have planning that
13 address the significant safety, historic and visitor
14 experience and traffic management concerns. The dollars:
15 We have to know that there's enough dollars to do the work
16 right. We believe that the Park Service should be advised
17 to avoid cheap fixes, and that means going kind of for the,
18 kind of, whole enchilada.

19 Practice good fiscal management and accountability
20 over how the money is spent, and we will return to that in
21 terms of contract oversight by the Park Service.

22 You have to ensure that the maintenance program is
23 going to be funded, compatible with ideas that we had this
24 morning from other groups.

25 And help me with this, Barbara. Low maintenance

1 does not mean no maintenance. I'm not quite sure where we
2 were when we got that.

3 MS. PAHL: Well, a lot of the alternatives
4 talked about they were good because they were considered low
5 maintenance. We don't want people to assume that means no
6 maintenance.

7 MR. DAKIN: Okay; right.

8 Operationally, even though it's supposed to be a
9 low maintenance design, it has to be adequately taken care
10 of.

11 Pick an alternative that the contractor can do.
12 Constructability, again, is an issue. Obviously that was on
13 our minds, because Alternative 1 is such a piecemeal
14 approach.

15 Ensure historic preservation standards that flow
16 from planning and design all the way to construction, and
17 constant oversight from the Park Service and the Federal
18 Highway Administration to assure that the contract is -- the
19 standards that are set in this project are complied with.

20 Is there another alternative that should be
21 considered? Of course, we realized that other alternatives
22 were considered; that you did discuss things like closing
23 the road on one side at a time, which is something that has
24 come up in our previous meetings, and the idea of changing
25 it to one directional traffic, either on a rotating day or

1 rotating portion of day terms and using the loop tour using
2 Highways 49 and 89. Our point here is simply that if those
3 alternatives were considered and rejected for practical
4 constructability reasons, the reasons for their not being
5 included should probably be spelled out somewhere. Because
6 they were recurrent themes in the public participation
7 process. So we need to tell the public why those aren't on
8 the table. And that's it.

9 MS. TRIBE: Questions of this group.
10 Comments. Disagreements.

11 So what they're recommending, basically, is that
12 Alternative 1, which really isn't a no-action alternative in
13 specific NEPA terms, but it really is only do it when we can
14 get up there kind of alternative. So they're recommending
15 that it be dismissed?

16 MR. JEWETT: I don't think we can dismiss an
17 alternative. If we're looking at these -- as a body, we can
18 dismiss it in terms of whether or not we think it makes
19 sense to do it. But as a debatable alternative within the
20 public forum, we can't dismiss that end of the spectrum.
21 That's what NEPA is all about.

22 MS. TRIBE: So, Tony, you're
23 suggesting -- you might agree with all this, but it still
24 needs to be in the document with analysis display.

25 MR. JEWETT: I thought that was our job as

1 groups is, take a look in isolation of the alternative we
2 have and find out how to best frame it for public
3 discussion.

4 MS. TRIBE: And remember also, you were asked
5 if you could fix it, is it acceptable? And this group
6 thinks it isn't. So let's hear what others think.

7 MS. PAHL: Actually, I need a clarification
8 on one point. What is our task here? Is it our task to
9 recommend our preferred alternative --

10 MS. TRIBE: No.

11 MS. PAHL: -- or is it our task to say the
12 public should look at these three alternatives at a public
13 meeting?

14 MS. TRIBE: Or three or five or two. What
15 we're not doing here is looking at your preferred
16 alternative, because that's not what you've been asked to do
17 at this point. What we're asking you to do is come up with
18 acceptable alternatives at this point. And so -- Suzann.

19 MS. LEWIS: I think one of the things that
20 might help us is to, again, remind you what your Charter is.
21 Your Charter is to make a set of recommendations to the
22 National Park Service on how to rehabilitate the
23 Going-to-the-Sun Road.

24 So when I was listening to Alternative 1, what I
25 guess -- what my assumption moved to at the end of the

1 presentation is that the Committee may make a
2 recommendation -- one of the Committee's recommendations may
3 be that Alternative 1 not be considered any further as a
4 feasible alternative, simply stated. I mean, again, the
5 Charter is to make -- put a set of recommendations forward
6 to the National Park Service. Then the National Park
7 Service will take those recommendations and make a
8 determination of how we'll put them through a NEPA process.

9 MS. PAHL: Can I ask a question to that
10 question? Does NEPA require the no-action alternative?

11 MS. LEWIS: Absolutely.

12 MS. TRIBE: Yes.

13 MS. PAHL: Well, there you go.

14 MS. TRIBE: Well, if you call this no action.

15 MR. JACKSON: It seems like the status-quo
16 alternative. And it's interesting, because this group kind
17 of suggests that after construction is done of some of these
18 other alternatives, visitation will increase. Yet in the
19 socioeconomic analysis, I don't think they knew how to
20 guesstimate that. I think that's -- and so in a funny way,
21 what you're saying the outcome of this is very different
22 than the other outcomes that we're going to look at. And I
23 think we should remember that. Because they may, in fact,
24 be right, that an improved road will increase use after it's
25 improved. And I don't think that that is really

1 contemplated in a funny way, because it just goes back to
2 that baseline measure. And the baseline measure of what we
3 use for this alternative, are also socioeconomic analysis,
4 and that may be wrong.

5 MS. PAHL: I'm totally confused by what he
6 said. And Dave, when you say "this group," group 1 or --

7 MR. JACKSON: Group 1, whatever this group
8 is.

9 MS. TRIBE: Whoever did this alternative.

10 MS. PAHL: As a member of this group, we
11 didn't have that discussion you just said we had.

12 MR. DAKIN: We, in fact, David, believed that
13 it would decrease visitation, to use Alternative 1, because
14 of the never-ending construction and inconvenience. And it
15 was our sense that this alternative -- I believe I'm
16 speaking for Barbara and Don -- would still be on the menu
17 of alternatives the Park Service would take to the public,
18 but that we find it probably very unattractive, in terms of
19 solving the problem.

20 MS. PAHL: We didn't talk about how it would
21 increase or decrease visitation. We just said there would
22 be a constant, every year, annual disruption. We didn't say
23 numbers will go up or down.

24 MR. JACKSON: If you look at the handout in
25 the socioeconomic analysis, where it has direct economic

1 impacts for Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, there's no
2 decrease. And you're saying it will, in fact, decrease.
3 And then for the other three we say there are big decreases.
4 Is that a fair statement?

5 MS. TOWNSEND: As I best understood
6 Alternative 1, from a socioeconomic point of view, it was
7 extremely similar, if not identical, to current practices.
8 And so to say Alternative 1 would result in a reduction in
9 visitors from the baseline, if I can use that word, I don't
10 think that's a fit. To me, it's incredibly similar to
11 current practices. And what the purple group is saying is
12 current practices are not acceptable.

13 MS. PAHL: What she said. That's what we
14 said.

15 MS. TRIBE: Well, I wonder if I could go back
16 and just read the Charter, also, based on the very first
17 thing when -- Barbara, when you said What are we doing here?

18 The purpose of the Committee is to advise the
19 National Park Service in the development of alternatives for
20 rehabilitation of the road. And so not to select a
21 preferred, it doesn't say that anywhere; not to come to
22 consensus on one, but the development of alternatives.

23 So what we wanted to do in this discussion is not
24 put alternatives forward that you said This is a crock, this
25 will never go, it's a waste of time, et cetera; straw people

1 alternatives, if you will. That used to be called straw
2 men, but in this politically correct world. So straw men
3 alternatives are alternatives that you'd just throw out
4 there, and the public says Well, they'd never do that, and
5 there's only one obvious one. And then you're accused of
6 being predisposed to have already made your decision.

7 So what Tony is saying is, We need to sort out
8 among these alternatives and the new one's that are
9 suggested; whether these are straw men or if they're truly
10 alternatives that need to be looked at. And so it's true
11 that with NEPA we do have to have a no action. If this
12 serves as no action because, as Jean just said, basically
13 this is what's happening now, it will have to go in the NEPA
14 document, but with our understanding that what it really
15 does is analyze need for the road rehabilitation rather than
16 anything else.

17 MR. JEWETT: That's exactly the point. And
18 that's why I thought the exercise that we're going through
19 is saying If this is one of the range of alternatives, how
20 do we integrate the considerations and things we've heard
21 within the parameter of repairs needed to make it better.
22 That's the exercise we went through.

23 MS. TRIBE: And what this group has said, the
24 purple group up here, is that they did not feel that it was
25 fixable to the point that it would be Listen, public, you

1 really need to look at this one as a real one, but we want
2 you to see what would happen if we did this one, in terms of
3 impact.

4 MR. KRACUM: From our perspective, from the
5 engineering perspective, Alternative 1 is really less than
6 what you're getting now. And Alternative 2 is more of what
7 you're doing because of the dollars -- the amount of dollars
8 that you're spending and the procedure that you're going
9 through in concert with FHWA. That's my two cents.

10 MS. PAHL: I think you're right.

11 MS. TRIBE: I'm just thinking, if I was a
12 member of the public, might I think it's a reasonable
13 approach that if I think I'm really going to be impacted by
14 the road being closed, that I might say to you, Well, can't
15 you just go up there and fix the pieces as they break down?
16 Is that reasonable?

17 MR. KRACUM: That's what that is.

18 MS. TRIBE: Exactly. So the question then
19 is, should this go forward, not as an acceptable alternative
20 in terms of you thinking it should be chosen, but should it
21 be one of the alternatives that should be examined?

22 And I was assuming, Bill, that you were suggesting
23 no.

24 MR. DAKIN: We were saying yes, that it
25 should be on the menu of alternatives, but our evaluation of

1 it, in terms of its fit with the criteria, is that it is
2 not -- it does not solve the problem.

3 MS. TRIBE: Okay. So do we agree that this
4 alternative would not solve the problem?

5 People that agree that this alternative would not
6 solve the problem please stand up.

7 (All members stand up.)

8 MS. TRIBE: You can stretch if you want while
9 you're up, but I've got two-thirds easy.

10 So the second question is, should this alternative
11 be kept on the table, in terms of further analysis?

12 Suzann, I had Susie ahead of you.

13 MS. BURCH: Oh, no. I was just raising my
14 hand to a question ahead of the question.

15 MS. LEWIS: Maybe it would help generate the
16 discussion or the consensus we need to move to is, does the
17 Committee want to include in its recommendations that
18 Alternative 1 be -- I mean, again, since your Charter is to
19 make recommendations to the National Park Service on
20 rehabing the road, does the Committee want to include in its
21 recommendations how Alternative 1 should be addressed or not
22 addressed?

23 MS. TRIBE: And I think that's what the
24 purple group is trying to do.

25 MR. JEWETT: Do we need to decide this now?

1 I'll make a motion that we include Alternative 1 as a
2 recommendation that the National Park Service include it in
3 the EIS.

4 MS. TRIBE: Okay; and that you would like,
5 also, that this information that they've added to it be
6 thought about in the analysis.

7 MR. JEWETT: Yeah; whoever does the EIS take
8 a look at those things to make it a better alternative.

9 MR. BAKER: Which will give credence to why
10 they said no.

11 MS. TRIBE: Now, Tony proposed something, but
12 since we're not doing Roberts Rules here, I'm going to take
13 these two comments.

14 Barbara, and then Jayne.

15 MS. PAHL: I would agree with that, provided
16 it was seen as the no-action alternative.

17 MS. TRIBE: No action. Or as Joe said, the
18 less-than-action alternative.

19 Jayne.

20 MS. KREMENIK: I guess I have a little bit of
21 a different perspective because I was working on Alternative
22 2, and they are so close. And the recommendations in
23 Alternative 1 seem to put it into the category of
24 Alternative 2. It's almost like, in my mind, those two can
25 be combined to become an alternative. So I'm just kind of

1 thinking ahead on that. So I'm not comfortable with saying
2 yes, we should accept 1 until we've examined number 2 and
3 whether those should be put together.

4 MS. PAHL: And that maybe speaks to why we
5 ought to go through them all and then come back and call the
6 question.

7 MS. TRIBE: So what can we say about this one
8 so far?

9 MS. PAHL: Put it aside.

10 MR. BAKER: Table it.

11 MS. TRIBE: So that's a process act, but what
12 can we say we about this alternative, so far?

13 MS. PAHL: We already have.

14 MR. BAKER: We don't know; we want to see 2.

15 MS. TRIBE: But we think maybe we know we
16 have to have something at this level in the analysis, one or
17 another.

18 MS. PAHL: No, we don't know that. We want
19 to go through them all and then see how they combine and
20 don't combine before we recommend.

21 MS. TRIBE: And my comment was just that we
22 know that NEPA requires a no-action alternative.

23 MS. PAHL: Exactly.

24 MS. TRIBE: All right. So can we move ahead
25 to 2? Who is presenting 2? Thank you. Oh, sure; she made

1 the comment.

2 MS. KREMENIK: My group was with Anna Marie
3 and Susie, and we went through Alternative 2. And I guess
4 one thing I can say to sort of talk about our first
5 criteria, the construction costs. To preface this, we had a
6 discussion about sort of the thing that hasn't been really
7 talked about here today is the current climate, and whether
8 we think that in light of the last week's activities,
9 whether we felt that funding of a major -- on a major level
10 was realistic for this type of project. Because of that, we
11 wanted to give this alternative, even though it was our
12 task, we definitely wanted to give this alternative very
13 real consideration in terms of it being an alternative that
14 would be selected based on what we thought was realistic
15 funding requirements for the project.

16 We did a review of the criteria 2, even though it
17 didn't say to put this on our flip chart. We went through
18 it because we thought there would be some important points
19 to put out on criteria number 2. For the pages 75 and 76,
20 the Engineering Study, pages 3 and 4 of the Project
21 Agreement, we thought those were handled efficiently and
22 effectively in the studies. So we went straight to the
23 criteria that our group had come up with.

24 And the first one was construction costs. In
25 terms of the criteria, this is the second-most expensive for

1 construction. We wanted to make sure the group was aware of
2 that. This isn't the cheapest method of fixing; it's
3 actually quite expensive. So we didn't know if we were
4 comfortable as a group recommending that we go ahead with
5 one of the most expensive contract alternatives.

6 And to get into the same discussion that you guys
7 had about baseline, it did say in our alternative that for
8 economic costs, that this was so similar to Alternative
9 number 1 that it could be considered along those lines. And
10 we weren't comfortable with suggesting that that was the
11 baseline point to determine the economic effect.

12 Reality, the road construction, the last 15 years
13 of construction projects, the word getting out that
14 potentially the road is closed, that's already had an effect
15 on the economy of the area. It may already have an effect
16 on the baseline that's included as part of that survey. So
17 we wouldn't like to say that this doesn't have an economic
18 impact effect.

19 The other part is, this is sort of the second
20 level, in terms of safety concerns. So we're looking at
21 second-highest level of potential catastrophic failure
22 which, of course, would have huge economic impacts.

23 One of the other criteria, stewardship of the
24 road. We thought this really didn't address stewardship of
25 the road. We're not being real kind to our resource having

1 20 years of construction vehicles moving through that area.
2 We didn't think, from an environmental perspective, it was
3 particularly good having all those construction vehicles and
4 noise and all that kind of stuff for 20 years associated
5 with the road project. So we really didn't feel that it met
6 that criteria either.

7 Maintenance costs; this one and Alternative 1
8 seemed to be the highest level of maintenance costs because
9 they're not quickly and efficiently taking care of the
10 problems. There's going to be continued high maintenance
11 costs on the road, needs that aren't being met, because the
12 problems aren't being taken care of. So we figured that
13 this one, also, came at a very high level of maintenance.

14 I'd already addressed safety. And this isn't the
15 best because of the least amount of attention paid to
16 catastrophic failure. But we did -- in our discussion of
17 safety, we decided that it's very similar to what's going on
18 now. We don't doubt that the Park Service and
19 whichever -- forgive me not knowing all your road agency
20 names. But whoever is working on this is going to take care
21 of those most serious problems first. I don't think any of
22 us are particularly concerned that some car is going to be
23 on the road and a portion is going to fail. We have enough
24 confidence that there's people up there fixing the things
25 that are most urgently needing the fixing.

1 Access is one of the criteria. We're still
2 impacting access. There's still going to be closures in
3 whatever kind of traffic management we have. But in terms
4 of the way that this was describing access, as an
5 alternative, this was the closest to what our committee came
6 up with last time; saying -- what was it? Maybe you can
7 read that -- 2, 15-minute delays.

8 MS. BURCH: Current traffic guidelines could
9 be used which limit visitor delays to 15 minutes at each
10 construction site with a maximum of two sites, one on each
11 side of Logan Pass. Two-hour delays are allowed at night
12 and three days per week at two Friday afternoons in October.

13 MS. KREMENIK: The first portion of that came
14 out of what our recommendations were, I believe, from our
15 last committee; that that's what we considered were maximum
16 levels of delays for the road. So it did meet that
17 criteria.

18 Greater impact on the traveling public; we're
19 working at 20 years of people seeing road construction going
20 on on that -- on any portion of the road if we're dragging
21 it out for that long, and we felt that that does impact the
22 traveling public. We have a large percentage of people that
23 are return visitors. They might not be return visitors if
24 they've come back twice, seen road construction twice, they
25 might not plan that third visit. So we felt that that was

1 an impact, since we'll be planning the construction over a
2 longer period of time.

3 Communication to the public. We had quite a big
4 discussion about this one. Because it was so similar to
5 what could be considered the status quo, we were thinking
6 that when we had to go out after the meetings as a Committee
7 and say What did you guys decide? Well, we're not going to
8 do anything different than we're already doing. We're just
9 going to plod along, it didn't seem like we had done our
10 job, basically. We hadn't made any recommendations or
11 gotten any further ahead than where we'd already started
12 from; that things were just going to plod along, it wasn't
13 really accelerated from that.

14 Our next one, the reason that we kept going and
15 kept paying so much attention to this not just because it
16 was our assignment, but because we thought this possibly
17 might be the most realistic, funding wise, if there wasn't
18 an opportunity to access large sums of funding over the
19 short period to get the work done. That this became a very
20 real option.

21 Alternative improvements. Well, I think our
22 number -- they're kind of in a different order than what
23 we've got written down here. Our number 1 alternative was
24 if we could accelerate the funding beyond the current level
25 of the projected 5 million dollars a year that was put to

1 this alternative, that it would speed things up. That would
2 be our first suggestion. If you could put more than 5 in,
3 then obviously those projects can be accomplished a lot
4 faster.

5 Our next alternative was to be ahead on design and
6 packing; take advantage of funds as they become available.
7 And that seems to be happening now. There seems to have
8 been an extra -- someone finds a couple million and it gets
9 put into a road project. And those most serious aspects are
10 handled. So we're seeing that to make this a better
11 alternative, to be further ahead on planning and design, to
12 take advantage of funds should they become available.

13 And we also suggested that they front load
14 maintenance costs to prevent further deterioration. If it's
15 20 years that this is being scheduled over, if some of those
16 major problems that are causing maintenance problems can be
17 front loaded, that that would reduce the overall cost of the
18 contract. And considering the cost of the contract, we
19 still thought that the 3-percent escalation rate was
20 probably a little bit low, and that this was going to end
21 up, over 20 years, costing quite a bit more than that.

22 We worked for hours on so many things. In its
23 current form, based on our suggestions, is this acceptable?
24 Well, based on cost estimates we thought yeah, that this
25 probably was acceptable. But we wanted to say that when we

1 came into this exercise, this was not our preferred
2 alternative. Any of the three people in our group didn't
3 sit down saying This is what we want to do, let's figure out
4 how to do it. It's just as we worked through it, we figured
5 yeah, this could be realistic, so that's how we're going to
6 approach it.

7 Based on our suggestions, again, the EIS, the
8 baseline, that we thought that that was affecting that.
9 Realistic based on funding, like I said. It includes
10 planning which seemed to be one of the differences between 1
11 and 2. So we thought that was an important feature,
12 however, still not our first option. I think that covers
13 most of that question.

14 Traffic management advice. Again, we thought this
15 fit best with our recommendations from the last Committee
16 meeting. However, we realize that's probably not realistic
17 for doing some of the major construction work, just having
18 15-minute delays. There's, obviously, some areas of
19 construction that need to have larger staging areas, longer
20 closures, and this probably doesn't speak to that real well.
21 So we wanted to be realistic about that.

22 Other traffic management suggestions. Real-time
23 information. We think it would be really helpful, if you're
24 sitting at the base of the hill, you know what's going on up
25 there so you know what to expect. And some type of

1 procedure to allow that information to be disseminated in
2 the Park and outside of the Park. So Travel Montana can
3 help direct people there with some real expectations.

4 We thought skilled flaggers and traffic management
5 was probably a really good idea. And most of the people in
6 our group had been through the Park over the course of the
7 summer and commented on how great it was to have the
8 flaggers come up to your car and tell you what was going on
9 and walk up to all the cars. And we thought that that was,
10 you know, a great feature for the construction and something
11 that could even be enhanced. Maybe they've got a little
12 more interpretation information, they can point out some
13 mountain features. One of the suggestions was to -- I'm not
14 going to go there. Bear baiting for visitor entertainment
15 purposes. We left that one off there.

16 MS. BURCH: We just thought we could throw
17 the carcasses off.

18 MS. KREMENIK: We didn't seriously put that
19 one down.

20 Credibility and signage was one of the things that
21 was brought up a few times, and this was brought up by
22 people who travel through the Park quite frequently. If you
23 have a sign saying construction ahead 30 minutes or expect
24 delays, there should be some construction further down the
25 road. And basically what it said is if there is men working

1 ahead, we really wanted to see this.

2 MS. BURCH: We said we wanted to see them
3 with their shorts on.

4 MS. KREMENIK: The other suggestion we had
5 from the way the recommendation was written in the book, it
6 said closing on Fridays in October. And we figured the
7 weekends in the fall season is probably when you're going to
8 get your traffic, so it might be a suggestion to move those
9 Fridays to Tuesdays and Wednesdays or something like that
10 that's not going to affect that fall weekend traffic quite
11 so much.

12 Common elements of being included in all the
13 alternatives, we thought packaging the construction so we
14 continue exceed threshold visitor waiting periods. And
15 that's what Barney was saying about people sitting there for
16 four hours. We want to make sure that they know what those
17 thresholds are and the contracts are packaged so we're not
18 exceeding those.

19 Predictability. Some of the things that we talked
20 about is making traffic go from one direction to another on
21 Mondays and turning it around on Tuesdays. And we just
22 thought that was something that would be difficult to manage
23 and difficult to predict to the traveling public; there
24 would be confusion there. So when we think about our
25 alternatives, we want to make sure we're recommending things

1 that are easy to market and talk about and have a public
2 awareness campaign about -- we shouldn't make it so
3 complicated that none of us knows what's going on.

4 Again, credible information in all of the
5 alternatives, that we know what's going up on there.
6 Skilled flaggers, again.

7 That's about it.

8 Other alternatives or approaches to be considered.
9 We weren't necessarily in support of these, but we thought
10 we should write them down because they might come up. One
11 of them was the one-way traffic. We didn't care for this
12 one, because we believe that traveling in one direction on
13 the Going-to-the-Sun Road is a completely different
14 experience than traveling in the other direction. You see
15 different things, different scenery. We'd hate to recommend
16 that a visitor experience would be changed one way or
17 another by doing that, even though we realize that closing
18 one lane could pretty much have construction going all the
19 time and it speed up the lenght of the project. Again,
20 access to the top, to one side or the other, seems to be an
21 alternative keeps coming up and maybe should be considered.
22 But, again, it wasn't our first alternative. That was about
23 it.

24 MS. TRIBE: Thank you.

25 People gave me two comments during your

1 presentation. And one of them is that what appears here
2 while we're having this discussion is we have some confusion
3 about the word "acceptable." And we're talking about
4 acceptable, perhaps, in two different ways. One meaning, is
5 it acceptable as one of the alternatives that will be
6 analyzed in the future and, second, would it be acceptable
7 to this group, if it became the preferred? And our task
8 here, again, is to see if it's acceptable as one of the
9 alternatives to be analyzed in the future. We have not
10 asked you for a preferred alternative.

11 However, we're getting some flavor of how you feel
12 about it, because of sort of the testing of the alternatives
13 against those criteria. And one of the things that happens
14 there that really helps us think about mitigation measures
15 later because of the kinds of things we're hearing related
16 to that particular alternative. So, again, we're not trying
17 to sort out which you like and which you don't, although the
18 criteria exercise sort of pushes you that way. We're trying
19 to sort out, even if you don't like it, do you believe that
20 it should be analyzed or displayed for its warts and
21 positives and impacts and all those kinds of things. That
22 was the first comment.

23 The second one was from Denis. And he said I
24 could straighten out some of this stuff about the no action
25 and those kinds of things. And so what I asked him to do is

1 to be willing to wait to make those comments after we've
2 looked at all the alternatives, so that you don't have to do
3 it twice. I think that would be a helpful time to do that.

4 So having said those two things -- and thank you
5 for the input from both of you -- are there things that you
6 want to say about what they just said? They said you ought
7 to keep it, it ought to be analyzed, it isn't their
8 preferred, but it certainly does meet some of the criteria,
9 and the public should be able to have a look at it.

10 MS. PAHL: Can I ask a question about that?
11 You're kind of saying two things about the cost. On the one
12 hand, you're saying it might be acceptable because it
13 doesn't cost as much, but yet you also acknowledge it costs
14 most at the end of the day. So that the total cost is
15 highest, but incremental cost, year to year, is less. So if
16 you're talking to Congress, how would you -- what would you
17 say? Say that it's cheaper, it's most expensive?

18 MS. MOE: I guess what we were looking at is
19 we were looking at the big picture. If you were looking at
20 the cost of the -- right; we were talking about two
21 different things. We were looking at the big picture, the
22 total cost to do the entire project is going to cost more in
23 the long-term. However, given current funding scenarios and
24 amount of funding that's been happening in the past, and in
25 light of last week's events, realistic funding that might be

1 available in the future for it, if you can't get a big
2 allocation of money, that this would be the way to go.

3 MS. TRIBE: Does that answer your question?

4 MS. PAHL: No, but probably.

5 MS. TRIBE: You were sort of thinking out
6 loud about that. And we have some -- Joe, you said to me
7 yesterday, aren't things different than last week? And we
8 have some huge things out there in the operating environment
9 that have a whole bunch to do with funding, with national
10 priorities, and none of us really know where that's going to
11 go.

12 So Anna Marie, you were saying that maybe based on
13 everything else, the one positive thing you'd say about this
14 is that it might be something that could be funded on a
15 year-by-year basis.

16 MS. PAHL: Can I ask Denis a question? In
17 the EIS scenario, how does that funding -- this is like a
18 pragmatic statement -- but it might be easier to get a
19 couple million a year as opposed to a 200-million-dollar
20 appropriation. Is that part of an EIS analysis?

21 MR. DAVIS: It certainly could be. I
22 appreciate you giving me an opportunity to speak before the
23 group. I think sort of what Tony was doing was the question
24 of the alternatives that might be in the EIS. And I think
25 if you set that aside and don't consider yourselves with

1 that, that it will simplify your process here. That if you
2 really look at your task be what are acceptable alternatives
3 from this group, that if the Park Service selected it, that
4 you would probably be satisfied that we selected an
5 acceptable alternative. You know, that would probably give
6 us, I think, the greatest direction that we could get out of
7 this.

8 And so instead of a preferred alternative, we
9 might have, you know, two or three or four or five
10 alternatives that you consider acceptable, and that,
11 certainly, if we went forward with them, that those are
12 good, valid alternatives that we need to analyze in greater
13 detail with an EIS process. But then don't concern
14 yourselves with what is the no-action alternative or How
15 would we package the alternatives in the EIS? Just set that
16 aside.

17 MS. TRIBE: So you have -- kind of bring to
18 the table a third version of "acceptable," which is, if the
19 Park Service chose any one of these, they would be
20 acceptable to us. And that sort of pushes us into what's
21 preferred and what's not. And so I'm going to try to keep
22 us at the business of whether they went into the EIS or not.

23 MR. JACKSON: It's not preferred because as
24 preferred you'd be focusing in on one. We're saying What's
25 the range of acceptable? So -- anyway, I just thought I

1 would offer that and let you mull it over.

2 MS. TRIBE: All right. And I've got hands at
3 the table and then I'll come back here.

4 Barney first.

5 MR. O'QUINN: Denis, I just flatly don't
6 agree with you. I think this is part of the public
7 participation process, and this is an integral part of the
8 whole environmental study process. And I think that we
9 wouldn't be doing our job if we weren't looking at this from
10 the standpoint of what alternatives should be carried
11 forward and put into the environmental study. I think
12 that's part of what we're doing.

13 And by the same token, that's one of the concerns
14 I have with the engineering report that we have. It doesn't
15 address alternatives that have been considered and dismissed
16 and why they might have been dismissed as viable
17 alternatives. Because in not doing that, I think we're
18 going to be revisiting that, or Park Service is going to be
19 revisiting, over and over. We get into a situation that the
20 consultant has looked at an alternative and said This
21 alternative doesn't make sense for sundry reasons. Why does
22 then the next consultant have to go through that same
23 analysis process in the EIS? This is all part of that input
24 for that.

25 And with respect to the alternatives that we're

1 considering from the an EI standpoint or any other process,
2 I'm somewhat confused. They all seem to be basically one
3 alternative as to how you would do it, depending on the
4 level of funding. It's not so much a difference of
5 alternatives of what you're gonna do. It depends on how
6 much money you get to do it with, and this is the way we
7 will approach it. Particularly 1, 2 and 3. And that
8 bothers me to some degree. Because I don't think they are
9 really different alternatives. It's a matter of how much
10 have you got to do it with.

11 MS. TRIBE: So we have two points on the
12 table right now. First one has to do with what happens to
13 these alternatives. And, again, pulling your Charter out,
14 it says, at the last sentence in your Charter, "These
15 alternatives will then be analyzed in an environmental
16 document".... So that sort of -- that will provide the
17 basis for the agency's decision process.

18 So I think that sort of means, here, that the
19 alternatives you're developing, Denis, that the group would
20 expect that they'd be analyzed. Does that help sort that
21 out a little bit? It's the third sentence of the Charter.

22 And the other point that Barney's bringing up is,
23 Are there additional alternatives that we have looked at?
24 He's saying I think, for sure, there are. And what I tried
25 to do in this exercise is flush out alternative approaches

1 that aren't there. And I'm hoping, as we hear other groups,
2 that some of those alternative approaches will come forward.

3 Now, Suzanne, you had your hand up.

4 MS. LEWIS: What you said.

5 MS. TRIBE: So now, back again to Jayne and
6 Susie and please forgive.

7 MR. BANCALE: I'd like to offer something
8 about the EIS process. My name is Mark Bancale. I work for
9 the consultant team.

10 The EIS does not have to analyze all alternatives.
11 It has to analyze reasonable and prudent alternatives. And
12 if the preparers -- also, the alternatives that are analyzed
13 should address the purpose of and the need for the
14 improvements. So that's sort of a screening level that you
15 pass through before you get to the, hopefully, manageable
16 number of alternatives that are carried through the entire
17 EIS analysis. This is part of what, I think, is going on
18 here, is trying to get through that first reasonable and
19 prudent test.

20 Alternative 1 might not be considered either
21 reasonable or prudent, or maybe it doesn't meet the purpose
22 or need for the improvements, in which case it can be
23 eliminated. And as was just pointed out, there would be a
24 discussion in the EIS that said Here was an alternative that
25 was looked at, it was eliminated. There's actually a

1 section of the EIS that's required alternatives that were
2 considered but eliminated, and you describe why. So just
3 because it was presented here, doesn't mean it has to go any
4 further than this room today. It would have to have a
5 logical and defensible reason to be eliminated, but it can
6 be eliminated.

7 MS. TRIBE: Without the big drawn out --

8 MR. BANCALE: Without any additional
9 analysis. As long as you have a defensible reason for doing
10 it.

11 MR. O'QUINN: The flip side of that, and I
12 agree with you completely, and I go back to what I said. I
13 think we're really looking at one basic alternative with
14 different approaches, depending on level of funding.

15 Now, what my question is, has the consultant
16 looked at other alternatives and dismissed them, for
17 whatever reason, and not provided that information in the
18 report?

19 MR. KRACUM: In the EIS process, generally,
20 when you look at alternatives for road work, for instance,
21 you look at different alignments. And if I were to say Were
22 there any alternatives? Yes, there's another alternative.
23 Put a road somewhere else. That doesn't make sense. So
24 yes, we did look at some others. Another alignment doesn't
25 make any sense. So, no, I didn't put that in the document.

1 As far as the one-way loops, we discussed those. And what
2 we determined was we tried to come up with a range of
3 alternatives for you to look at and try to come to an
4 agreement so that we can take that further in the documents
5 in the EIS documents.

6 MS. TRIBE: And before we close today, I
7 think -- you know, we have a long ways to go on this
8 alternative discussion. So, Barney, it might be useful to
9 see all five of them up here and then ask the same question
10 again. Do we only have one or two up there, and are there
11 others that should be added?

12 I've got Suzann and then Randy.

13 MS. LEWIS: I was just going to mention that
14 I think, Barney, you're onto something, in the sense
15 that -- it's hard for us because we've been going at this
16 for a while to remember. The General Management Plan was
17 the first start on a public process about the road. So a
18 lot of the alternatives, like realigning the road, build a
19 new road, use a high alpine train, tram system, all those
20 other types of alternatives were considered and rejected and
21 went through a public process under the General Management
22 Plan. So that sort of broad-based screening, this group had
23 to begin with -- we began in our first meeting with what the
24 General Management Plan said about the Going-to-the-Sun
25 Road. So I think some of that lack of how many other

1 alternatives did we look at and reject, might not be part of
2 where we are now in the process but are a historical part of
3 where we are today and well documented in a public process
4 with a legal record of decision. Why this group's not going
5 to go back and re-examine that.

6 MR. O'QUINN: But the loop wasn't examined.

7 MS. LEWIS: The loop. The Highway 2, 49, 89;
8 right. Well, I'm going to say I don't think it was
9 examined.

10 MR. O'QUINN: I don't think so.

11 MS. TRIBE: Regardless of all the
12 alternatives that were or were not, I think Suzann gives us
13 a real important piece of information. In a sense, this is
14 sort of an integrative process. And what you just said was
15 the General Management Plan went through a NEPA process?

16 MS. LEWIS: Extensive.

17 MS. TRIBE: It has either a record of
18 decision or decision --

19 MS. LEWIS: It has a record of decision less
20 than two years old.

21 MS. TRIBE: And within that, we've set
22 parameters for the road. And now we're going on, and so
23 that's one of the reasons that those multitude or two or
24 three alternatives were dismissed.

25 Okay; Randy, you had a comment.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I have a question. I'm not
2 very well versed on the NEPA process, so the question for
3 the NEPA people in here, whoever has expertise in that
4 field. I gather from what Mark has said here, that we can
5 dismiss an alternative, if we don't find it acceptable. But
6 are there any parameters in the NEPA process as to how many
7 alternatives we have to have on the table to meet the NEPA
8 requirements? Does it have to be three or more than three
9 or less than three?

10 MR. O'QUINN: Feasible and prudent.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Could it be one?

12 MR. BANCALE: Not typically. You have to
13 have a no build or a no action. That's a given. And then
14 in order for the process to be meaningful, you have to have
15 at least one action.

16 But I think the public would look really sadly on
17 that if there were your only two alternatives. So usually
18 it's in the neighborhood of three to five alternatives that
19 you work with for the very purpose of trying to keep it
20 manageable and understandable, as you go through the process
21 and as the public reads the documents. And NEPA doesn't
22 dictate that you have to have X number.

23 MS. TRIBE: I'm going to move us on, if we
24 could, to the next alternative. But remember what the NEPA
25 process is for. It's not to tie your hands. It's to

1 disclose the impacts of doing a project one way or another
2 to the public. It's a good document. It's just that we're
3 having this sort of philosophical discussion about How many
4 should be in there? Should we be able to toss a couple in
5 the beginning? We already know that there is an opportunity
6 to dismiss, based on good, sound reason, early, without full
7 analysis, and that some others are carried forward.

8 So one more time, moving back into our exercise,
9 let's go to Alternative 3, having heard what this green
10 group said, I mean that with no offense, about Alternative
11 2. And remember the comment Jayne made before 2, and that
12 was that maybe 2 and 1 are close enough that they really
13 could be one alternative. So just hold that thought.

14 Jodie, you're the presenter.

15 MS. STEWART: I am. Our group was Randy and
16 Suzann and myself. And our group was number 3.

17 How does this alternative meet or not meet the
18 criteria? We said yes, it does meet the criteria, when the
19 cost estimates are more comprehensive. And we felt that the
20 cost estimates probably excluded a lot of things. And I
21 think if we jump down to number 2, you'll see who our
22 thought process was on this.

23 Part of the things that we thought that they
24 excluded -- we did eventually talk to Joe and found out that
25 there were some things that were included that we were

1 unaware of.

2 But on B2, which is How could this alternative be
3 improved to make it more acceptable, then we kind of
4 broadened those factors. So we thought this alternative
5 should be expanded to expand the cost estimate to include
6 the additional categories of: maintenance and operation; a
7 good communication program, which would include
8 communication devices, a communications person on staff that
9 would be able to keep the information out there and to the
10 public. We also thought it should include the mitigation
11 program. And we realize that's a big scope of later, but we
12 thought that all of these costs need to be included in our
13 first general cost. Because if we're going to say It's only
14 going to cost us a hundred million dollars, then it has to
15 be a hundred million dollars. We can't come back and say
16 Well, we forgot to include in communication devices. We
17 didn't feel that that's properly addressed in any of the
18 alternatives, that none of this was included. And our point
19 is, if we go to Congress and say This is what we want, we
20 want it to be all inclusive, not to say Oops, we forgot
21 these things, so now let's eliminate a bunch of different
22 things in our programs.

23 Our last one was we didn't feel that it -- it
24 didn't address like the pullouts, you know, if they're going
25 to be additional pullouts as long as the road is being

1 reconstructed. Are we going to add additional pullouts,
2 additional bathrooms, and all for the same reasons. Why
3 should we go and do a 300-million-dollar program and say
4 Oops, we should have put a bathroom in there. So we didn't
5 feel that this addressed that either. You're going to find
6 that all of our answers are contained within this
7 part -- the rest of our answers. So I'm going to keep on
8 going with this. But the 3 percent escalating factor is too
9 low. We felt that that needs to be increased.

10 We did not like the use of the word "closure." We
11 thought that was unacceptable, and we think that a new term
12 needs to be defined there and it's meaning and use
13 consistently in all alternatives discussed. We think
14 "closure" has a bad connotation to it, and it kind of
15 creates public panic. So we want to see that word
16 eliminated.

17 MS. TRIBE: So something like visitors'
18 time-outs.

19 MS. STEWART: As a mother mother of seven,
20 yes. I'm not the mother of seven; you are.

21 Also included in our alternative was that there
22 were going to be 20 days in September and October that they
23 would pull out and do closures, whether they were alternate
24 Fridays, et cetera. We thought that we should incorporate
25 and maybe change that to be an October 1st closing deadline,

1 so we're actually incorporating Alternative number 4 into
2 ours into having an October 1st deadline and closure,
3 because from that point we aren't going to have a lot of
4 unexpected closures; it's a known venue that we can plan on
5 and prepare for. So in order to achieve the 20 days of
6 closure in Alternative 3, it's really hard reading sideways,
7 Suzann, during October, the end, I think I covered that.

8 Avoid weekend closures in September. That was
9 another one of our ideas. Oh, here was our example, right
10 here. Instead of closures, we can have temporary traffic
11 suspensions. That's something that's a little more
12 positive.

13 We thought that we should maximize nighttime work.
14 And we have in there efficient nighttime work. And we
15 understand that it is more difficult and more costly to work
16 at night. We've since talked to Joe, but we'd still like to
17 see that somewhat explored, that maybe we can do that
18 efficiently.

19 We thought we should utilize current real-time
20 visitor use of data and adjust the traffic management hours
21 accordingly. For example, instead of 7:00 to 10:00 a.m., we
22 might be able to go 7:00 to 11:00 a.m. And they've just put
23 out counters, within the last two months I believe, in the
24 Park, and so the traffic data is going to be a lot more
25 efficient than it has been. All this was based on traffic

1 data in 2000, I believe. So we think that that can be
2 pinpointed and streamlined.

3 As far as C, In its current form, based on your
4 suggestion for improvement, is this an acceptable
5 alternative for future analysis? Yes. On 2 of that, What
6 advice do you have related to traffic management? It's see
7 B2.

8 On D, which is, List the common elements should be
9 included in all alternatives. It's see B2.

10 E, which is, Is there another alternative or
11 alternative approach that should be considered? And we
12 thought that Alternative 4 should be considered in the
13 Advisory Committee recommendations. We thought that
14 Alternatives 1 and 2 should not be considered, due to time
15 and cost. And that's all that we have.

16 MS. TRIBE: Questions? Comments?

17 MR. KRACUM: With regards to the escalation
18 factor, it's a number that, no matter where I go, it's
19 always arguable. And so tell me the number you want me to
20 use. It's for comparison purposes only; 5 percent?

21 MS. LEWIS: I can accept that it's always
22 arguable. I think what we maybe were discussing -- and,
23 Randy, jump in here -- we don't know how to defend 3
24 percent. So if whatever number it changes to, what we're
25 looking for is a defensible number. I don't know why you

1 picked 3.

2 MR. KRACUM: Because it was low. Because it
3 was low on the defensible end. Because if I were to put 5
4 or 6, somebody would say that's too high.

5 MS. LEWIS: Well, we know that the Park
6 Service uses 4. So that that might be -- not saying that's
7 right, but that may be more defensible when somebody says
8 Well, why did you say 4-percent escalation percentage? The
9 Committee might say We want to use or adopt the Park
10 Service's standard in this area, just to get us to a point
11 where we can defend it.

12 MR. KRACUM: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Just to comment, to follow up
14 on that, you said yesterday during your presentation some
15 places it's 9, and you use 5 to 6 in Colorado. And one of
16 the concerns, I think, is that whatever it is the Park
17 Service decides to go forward with, they're going to have to
18 have some numbers to work with to ask Congress for an
19 appropriation. And we think that it would be erroneous to
20 go forward with an unreasonably low number and not have
21 enough to do the job, once they make their decision. So we
22 thought a more realistic escalation number could make sure
23 the request, whatever it winds up being, is adequate.

24 MS. TRIBE: And I think your honesty is
25 refresh. I used it because it was low. I used it because I

1 could do the math. But what we're hearing here is that
2 there needs to be some rationale for the selection of that
3 number, and that that rationale needs to be documented,
4 whether it's inflation figures or cost of living or whatever
5 the Park Service does simply to defend it.

6 Now, Barbara.

7 MS. PAHL: What is it in construction? In
8 the Denver area, we've been watching construction costs go
9 up way over inflation and cost of living. I mean, so is it
10 really 9 percent or not?

11 MR. KRACUM: Well, the governor has said, in
12 past discussions, that it was nearing 9 percent. And it's
13 different for different types of construction. It's
14 different for labor versus equipment versus materials. It's
15 different for different materials. And it is a tough thing
16 to generalize.

17 And I did -- I chose a generalization more for
18 comparison of the alternatives. Because if you were to just
19 look at the 2001 dollars of Alternative 1, for instance, you
20 would find a very different analysis comparing it to one of
21 the others. And so because it looks at whatever the
22 Alternative 1 dollars were, unless you say Look, this is
23 going to be spent over 50 years, once you add that 50-year
24 escalation, that's where it jumps out to you, that that's
25 really the most expensive way to go. So I chose to put an

1 escalation factor in to show you that difference, not,
2 necessarily, to say This is what it's going to cost.

3 MS. TRIBE: Now, if you would turn your page
4 back one, Joni. She said at the bottom that basically,
5 you're saying that Alternative 4 should be considered --

6 MS. STEWART: In the Advisory Committee
7 recommendations, and that Alternatives 1 and 2 should not be
8 considered.

9 MS. TRIBE: Okay. So if we're going back to
10 this acceptable business a minute, what you're saying -- I
11 want to check. Are you suggesting that Alternatives 1 and 2
12 be dismissed in the way we talk about?

13 MS. STEWART: That was our thought.

14 MS. TRIBE: It was considered but we didn't
15 carry it forward because, and 3 and 4 should be put forward.
16 And just as a little side shot, you liked 4 best.

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Let me tell you where our
18 discussion came from. And there was a little bit of
19 discussion about the interpretation of the question. One
20 with the members of our committee said Well, are they
21 talking about an alternative that is separate from the five
22 presented? And my interpretation of it was, Is there
23 another one of the presented alternatives that should be
24 considered? And that's where that came from, you see. If
25 the question was intended to mean something different than

1 the five presented, then we didn't have anything else. But
2 if it was Should one of the others presented be considered?
3 then we thought 4 should be. So I'm not sure which way you
4 intended the question.

5 MS. TRIBE: I intended it as beyond the five,
6 but obviously, wasn't clear enough.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And this wasn't responsive to
8 that question. We weren't sure which way it should be
9 interpreted.

10 MS. TRIBE: But this is also useful. Because
11 you're saying besides the one, number 3, we also think that
12 4 should go forward for further analysis.

13 Thank you very much to your group.

14 Susie; sorry.

15 MS. BURCH: I just am, out of curiosity,
16 since 1 through 4 is addressed, did you have nothing you
17 wanted to say about 5?

18 MS. LEWIS: Ran out of time and thought we'd
19 wait 'til we heard the presentation.

20 MS. TRIBE: Well, let's go to Alternative 4.

21 MR. BAKER: Basically, I've just gone around
22 to our group again, as they were going through Alternative
23 3, and saying -- because 3 and 4 are so closely entwined
24 together, the only really big difference is the closure
25 times. And I went and I asked them Does what they just said

1 about 3, do you mostly agree with what they have said? And
2 they all said Yes. Is basically what was said in 3, with
3 the exception of the closing dates, we agree with. That
4 should be looked at; okay?

5 In Alternative number 4, the extended rehab
6 season, does it meet the following -- it does not meet the
7 following criteria: Economics. Shortens the operating
8 seasons. Puts the pressure on road opening in the spring.
9 We feel a visitor experience would be negatively impacted
10 primarily for the shortened fall season. They would have
11 unrealistic expectations about the closing. Gives the
12 visitor unrealistic expectations about -- of the Park season
13 again. We're really focused in on they know the opening
14 date, they know the closing date, they have to try and cram
15 everything in. We felt they might want to come in the fall.
16 Anybody who's in business in the Park knows that while there
17 is traffic in the fall, you get to a certain stage in time
18 and it does not become worthwhile anymore.

19 We did not feel that it was fair, primarily
20 because of the July 1st opening. We felt that needed to be
21 adjusted.

22 How could this alternative be improved to make it
23 more acceptable? Well, address the seasonal opening and
24 closing periods. Example: Maybe it should be the third week
25 in June open. Maybe it should close the third week in

1 September. Even one week, you know, earlier in June would
2 make a big amount of difference. Maybe it should be two
3 weeks. It's closer to the actual visitor traffic patterns
4 that currently happen now. It would not be that big of a
5 mind set adjustment, if there were opening and closing
6 dates. Oh, well, that's kind of what it is right now
7 anyways. So it would not be that much of a change for the
8 public perception of what's going on. It would reduce costs
9 and keeps closure period closer to what now exists. I just
10 talked about that.

11 Recommendations relative to this alternative. In
12 its current form, is this an acceptable alternative for
13 future analysis? Yes, with our improved recommendations.

14 The second part of that question, we feel that we
15 should investigate the feasibility of creating a one-way
16 eastbound corridor or loop. We feel it would probably
17 reduce traffic congestion and hazards while improving
18 construction -- the whole construction area. If they can
19 basically create one-lane only and use the other lane to do
20 all their construction work -- this was talked about last
21 fall -- it may take the most expensive option and scale it
22 back a little bit, as far as costs go.

23 We also feel that a shuttle system would be very
24 important, if we went with this, because there may be -- the
25 shuttle system would not be bound by the one way. It could

1 go either way, as do the emergency vehicles or construction
2 vehicles.

3 D, time delays. Elements you feel should be
4 included in all alternatives. Time delays, we felt that was
5 a good one to keep in all alternatives; one-way traffic,
6 maybe. Shuttle system should be included; interpretive
7 issues; credible communication strategy. All those are
8 common elements which we feel should be kept.

9 Is there another alternative that should be
10 considered? Yes. We felt that there should be two more.
11 We felt that there should be a 4A, called the extended rehab
12 with one-way routing. We felt, maybe, we could bring the
13 cost of the -- while still keeping the all the elements of 4
14 and 3, we felt maybe this might reduce costs. It may
15 enhance the visitor experience because they don't have to
16 worry about two-way traffic. We also felt that there should
17 be another one, 5A, close one side at a time. That was
18 based on a previous baseline request. That's it.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: On your objection to those
20 closure dates, were they primarily focused on the July 1
21 start date or on the October 1 closure date or both?

22 MR. BAKER: I think it was primarily focused
23 on the July 1 start date.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So were you still in
25 agreement that closure on October 1 was acceptable?

1 MR. BAKER: Well, we tried to keep within the
2 contractor's parameters, as he was looking for a specific
3 period of time. So we tried to balance it out. And
4 currently, right now, I think a lot of businesses would say
5 the third week in September is -- it may be good, it may not
6 be good. There's not a lot open here in the third week in
7 September. We could give up that week.

8 MS. TRIBE: So you were trying to balance it.

9 MS. LEWIS: You were trying to give a week
10 back in June.

11 MR. BAKER: We felt it was a more appropriate
12 balance.

13 MR. MEZNARICH: Just to add to that, we were
14 worried about the expectation of the public; that if it was
15 stated that the road was open July 1 through October 1, that
16 they might expect the full menu of services those last two
17 weeks in September, and that's not real. That's not how it
18 works now, and it's unrealistic to expect that to change.
19 So we thought stay with the same pattern of visitors that
20 currently exist, so that there isn't a change necessary in
21 mind set and there's not an unmet expectation by the part of
22 the visitors.

23 MS. TRIBE: Now, Susie, I think you had a
24 comment, and Roscoe might also.

25 MS. BURCH: I want to make sure I heard

1 correctly. You were saying one way -- that one of your
2 proposals was one-way with a shuttle, that would enable
3 people to go from the other direction; is that right?

4 MR. BAKER: What we looked at is, we know
5 that with the one-way scenario, it would cause a lot of
6 problems; hikers getting to trailheads, staff getting back
7 and forth, et cetera. If there was a mechanism put into
8 place on a one-way whereby at certain times in the day the
9 shuttle would run up to the points, drop off the hikers, it
10 could go up maybe in midday, maybe go up at the end of the
11 day. If there was still two lanes and the one lane was
12 designated for the through traffic and the other lane was
13 designated for emergency and construction traffic, there
14 probably is a mechanism there that you could use. But we
15 know that it wouldn't work if somebody had to travel all the
16 way around the Park just to get back up to the pass to go to
17 work, and they lived at St. Mary's, for example.

18 MS. TRIBE: So this construction lane would
19 accommodate cement trucks that had to go in and out.

20 MR. BAKER: Exactly.

21 MR. BLACK: Well, I guess the -- my question
22 is, you're saying close on the third weekend, are you saying
23 or give up the third week, which means you give up the third
24 and the fourth week of September?

25 MR. BAKER: Typically, it would open -- my

1 suggestion was the third Friday in June, so you get that
2 weekend. And you would close the third Monday in September.
3 That time frame, instead of picking a specific date.
4 Because then we run into the scenario of if the date falls
5 on the 20th of September and that happens to be a Saturday,
6 you don't want to close the road on a Saturday. So you'd
7 have to pick a consistent date, you know, whether it was the
8 third Monday or whatever.

9 MR. BLACK: So you're saying give up the 10
10 days that you're talking about, because the third Monday's
11 going to be somewhere around the 21st of September.

12 MR. BAKER: Exactly.

13 MR. BLACK: And, you know, GPI isn't closing
14 a majority of their facilities. I mean, at least they have
15 the Lake McDonald, and we're open until October the 1st.

16 I would say that the amount of traffic that you
17 get from the 15th of June to the 20th of June, say, is
18 probably not as much as we will in the future from the 20th
19 of September 'til the 25th of September. We're just seeing
20 more and more of the traffic fall into the fall, as opposed
21 to June picking up. June is slowly but surely slipping away
22 from us.

23 MR. BAKER: I totally agree. But we felt
24 that we needed at least one week -- if you said July 1, I
25 mean, you've only got four more days until July 4th.

1 MR. BLACK: And I agree with you on that
2 part. My suggestion would be to probably stretch this out a
3 little bit more.

4 MR. BAKER: So take it right to October 1.

5 MR. BLACK: Not --

6 MS. TRIBE: So you would take a week away,
7 basically, from the contractors.

8 MR. BLACK: Yeah.

9 MS. TRIBE: So what you were trying to do is
10 accommodate the amount of time the Engineering Report
11 suggested they needed, and you were trying to balance which
12 end you took it out of.

13 MR. BAKER: Exactly. However, I totally
14 agree with what Roscoe's saying. If we could take a week
15 away and it wouldn't impact it too much, great. But if they
16 require that, as is stated in Alternative 4, our preference
17 would be to add a week on in June to get everybody organized
18 to get open and -- at the expense of the week in the fall.
19 Future trends may dictate that might not be the wise move,
20 but it's tough to predict that.

21 MS. MOE: My question is, as you were moving
22 through the alternative -- I mean, as I understand
23 Alternative 4, it was to have the July 12 opening, October
24 1st closing, and then there was still going to be 10 days in
25 September that it was going to be closed. So are you

1 eliminating -- by moving back into September, are you
2 eliminating those 10 days?

3 MR. BAKER: Well, we had kind of hoped to.

4 MS. MOE: So you're just talking end
5 closures; nothing would be closed during the middle.

6 MR. BAKER: Give us an unencumbered -- a
7 good, solid three weeks in September.

8 MS. MOE: I just wanted to be clear that's
9 what we're doing.

10 MS. PAHL: Can I ask Joe a question? If
11 you're eliminating these closure periods and 10 days in
12 September and further reducing -- have you just basically
13 eliminated Alternative 4 as a concept? Do you still have
14 enough closure time to make this viable, or is it really, at
15 this point, not viable? Have we just kind of slid 4
16 through?

17 MR. KRACUM: I'm going to let Nick handle
18 that one. He was very involved in that piece.

19 MR. SENN: I wasn't sure when to hop into
20 these conversations, but name is Nick Senn. I work for
21 Washington. I put together a lot of the scheduling and cost
22 estimates and worked a lot on the engineering portions of
23 the document for Washington.

24 I think we were already pushing the envelope on a
25 lot of these ideas. So I think when you whittle away weeks

1 at a time, the problem is you get into shoulder seasons, and
2 you're throwing in a whole lot of unknowns. And I think
3 you're adding a lot more risk to those contracts, and you
4 might pay for that risk. So you might by compressing that
5 time period, by pushing this, that could escalate the cost
6 pretty significantly, because you're essentially asking the
7 contractor to pick that up. I would think that the time
8 frames we be put together were very aggressive. And so I
9 would -- it would be you might lose a year in option 4.

10 MS. TRIBE: So in response to her question,
11 then, are they pushing it so much that 4 actually becomes 3?

12 MR. SENN: I think it very well could or
13 escalate the cost, if you want to hold down time frames.

14 MS. PAHL: So it becomes 3.

15 MR. SENN: Yes, it could.

16 And I don't know whether this is the right time
17 either, but Joe, Mark and I have been also discussing the
18 one-loop alternative. It's not really addressed in the
19 document, but I'm currently the project manager for a
20 project on State Highway 2 in Colorado for our portion of
21 support of CDOT. Essentially, we're doing a one-way during
22 the day. We're turning State Highway 2 into a one-way and
23 then turning it over at 3:30 every day to two-way traffic.

24 That's a hundred-million-dollar project, but it's
25 three miles. And the complexities of doing this project in

1 a three-mile detour, you know, it was almost insurmountable
2 for the first three months of that. I would say the
3 complexity of this one-way operation gets really
4 complicated. Because in that lane that's being taken, it's
5 not something you can turn over for a lot of construction
6 traffic. You're going to have opposing stops. So I think
7 it's very intrusive to do that because of the distance.

8 So we have a three-mile project where,
9 essentially, we act like we drive in England for the
10 duration of the day, and then we go back to normal diving
11 operations. But it's pretty complex. It's very -- the
12 further we get into it, there's a lot more safety issues
13 than we thought, at first. I would say that that
14 alternative adds a lot of risk, just on the surface. So I
15 would be very concerned about it.

16 MS. TRIBE: Okay. So you've given this some
17 analysis for an alternative that wasn't up there, but it
18 helps us think about it. Thank you.

19 Lowell.

20 MR. MEZNARICH: I think there's a little bit
21 of confusion there. The 10 working day requires road
22 closure in September each year in the Alternative 4. Those
23 are sporadic days, are they not? It's not 10 continuous
24 days. What we're proposing is make it 10 consecutive days.
25 We think you'd be a lot more productive in those 10

1 continuous days than you would be in 10 days spread
2 throughout. That that many might have the value of 12 or 13
3 work days. And there is still that period -- for example,
4 this year I think it was the 7th that the road was open,
5 June, 7th or 8th? I was up there on the 9th, and that
6 seemed like it was the second or third day. So if the road
7 was opened on the 6th and the contractor had access to the
8 20th, that's two weeks. So you still have, I believe, every
9 day that we've anticipated in this alternative, and maybe
10 even more, by shifting it in the manner that was suggested.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Two things. Are you guys
12 suggesting, then, the trade, then, the last 10 days of
13 September for the last 10 days in June?

14 MR. MEZNARICH: It was just a swap.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And I was just taking a look
16 at -- for the Committee's information, there's this visitor
17 use graph that Jean did in her study on page 64. And it
18 looks like the last week or 10 days in June, there's an
19 awful lot more visitors in the Park than there are in the
20 last week or 10 days in September. So the trade-off would
21 enhance --

22 MR. BAKER: That's currently now. But what
23 Roscoe is saying is that may not be what future trends are.

24 MR. MEZNARICH: And the intent was to match
25 the actual visitation trends, so if they would change in the

1 future, this plan would make -- these alternative dates
2 would probably shift too.

3 MR. O'QUINN: I think the one thing you need
4 to think about, in the spring, I think it's more uncertain
5 and you're talking about giving a contractor time to work.
6 And you're giving him a very short period and then cutting
7 him off. Whereas in the fall, if you're giving him that
8 early time, I think you've got a little more certainty that
9 you're going to have workable weather, and then he can work
10 on beyond that. You're not cutting him off. He can work
11 maybe on into November or as long as the weather holds for
12 him. But if on the other end, he's going to be cut off
13 completely and you've got no work going on. So if I was the
14 contractor, I'd rather have the fall than the spring.

15 MR. BAKER: Then you bring in your
16 socioeconomic issues, and that's where you've got to find
17 out --

18 MR. JACKSON: I think the real essence of
19 this suggestion is, because there's a potential to gain by
20 marginal changes in the beginning and ending of the
21 contract, there should be a lot more thought given to that
22 than may have been given at this time, but we don't know
23 that. But the graph shows that you can move the period and
24 gain days. That's the way it looks, at least historically.
25 So we kind of suggested you look at that. It isn't as if we

1 know the answer, but I think it's a thoughtful suggestion,
2 is all it's intended to be.

3 MR. BAKER: We know we didn't like July 1.

4 MS. TRIBE: And in addition, you tried to box
5 up those 10 days in September in one efficient period rather
6 than scattering them throughout the month.

7 Okay; thank you very much.

8 Let's look at the last one; 5.

9 MR. JEWETT: This is the closure one, and we
10 decided we're going to close the road.

11 We were the fifth group. This was termed the Road
12 Segment Closures Alternative. It was Linda, Barney, Roscoe,
13 and myself.

14 Let me just say at the outset that we struggled
15 with the same questions other people have struggled with
16 which are What are the side boards of this discussion? And
17 we decided, finally, that the side boards of this discussion
18 were we were tasked to look at the issue of closing this
19 road, at some point, and what would that alternative look
20 like if it integrated all the various concerns we've heard
21 from the community and other segments to make it the best
22 possible road closure alternatives. So that's the parameter
23 we used.

24 Criteria. What criteria did it mean? I'm going
25 to rush through these. We thought it meant construction

1 costs criteria; it meant safety; it meant historic
2 retention; it was fundable, very fundable, probably the most
3 fundable. We threw in a new criteria, because the criteria
4 we talked about this morning had to do with
5 engineering -- not alternatives but concepts; right? And so
6 we didn't think that those, necessarily, all fit
7 alternatives. So it meant to-do-it-quickly criteria, which
8 we think is an important criteria. Met the protection of
9 the road criteria and the long-term solution criteria. So
10 those it met.

11 What it didn't meet, in our view, was that it
12 didn't satisfy the gateway economics alternative; gateway
13 communities; it failed, utterly, on a visitor experience
14 criteria; it made it difficult to communicate to the public
15 or else simple, one way or another, which you can't go; and
16 we didn't think it was very realistic as an approach. We
17 also threw in a third thing which was a Who knows? Who
18 knows if it meets it, who knows if it doesn't meet it?
19 Which is the criteria of future options. Did it satisfy the
20 criteria of leaving open future options? Did it satisfy the
21 criteria of trying new things that could lead to future uses
22 of the road? We didn't know. That was the first question.

23 How could this alternative be improved? which was
24 question B under criteria, to make it more acceptable? If
25 you remember, this -- the elements of the road closure

1 alternative, as it was presented here, was that the segments
2 of the road be closed from 7:00 p.m. Sunday to 10:00 a.m.
3 Friday. Basically closed all week long. And then reopened
4 Friday morning and open all weekend. That was the elements
5 of it.

6 We thought that how it could be improved was it
7 currently is very poorly defined. What's the definition of
8 a segment closure? Did that include mandatory access to
9 Logan Pass? Must be maintained or not? We had no idea.
10 Was a segment closed on the east side and west side so that
11 the middle of the Park was cut off? We had no idea. Very
12 important consideration. How much of the road access is
13 still available, within given closures? Are there five
14 closures, six closures, one closure? And the reason we got
15 into this was because we think that it's a legitimate public
16 discussion to talk about, whether or not there can be a
17 defined closure alternative, so the public can at least talk
18 about it. Because, clearly, that's come up over and over
19 again. Improvement is just better definition.

20 Draft C was draft recommendations related to this
21 alternative in its current form.

22 First question was, Is it acceptable in its
23 current form? And we said No, it wasn't. We said No, it
24 wasn't, because if you are going to close the road, you need
25 to -- if you're going to make a decision to close the road,

1 that decision has to be based on optimum construction
2 efficiencies. If you're going to take that kind of a step,
3 you better take advantage of that step by making sure your
4 construction defficiencies are the best they can possibly
5 be. The point is, if you're going to close it, do
6 construction quickly. And we didn't feel that it was
7 acceptable because it didn't do that.

8 Help me with that one, Barney.

9 MR. O'QUINN: That was part of the definition
10 that we didn't want it to be such that if we were going to
11 use closure in this particular alternative, that you could
12 close off access to Logan Pass. You had to be able to get
13 there from the east or the west. And the way it's worded
14 right now, you could be working on the east side and the
15 west side and close off the whole section.

16 MR. JEWETT: That was the point I made
17 before. Poor definition says it could be worked on both
18 sides concurrently, which makes it unacceptable.

19 MR. O'QUINN: Your first point there was
20 really a question. If you're going to go through the
21 business of closure and not close one side or the other
22 side, this four on/three off, is that efficient
23 construction? If the public is going to be reacting? And,
24 furthermore, is the contractor going to be spending all day
25 Thursday to get in a position to open the road back up for

1 Friday morning and then he's in a continuing
2 start-up/shut-down mode.

3 MR. JEWETT: Okay. So that gets us to the
4 second bullet under recommendations. And the parameters of
5 that were What advice do you have related to traffic
6 management to make this a better alternative? And we just
7 basically said that you've always got to have at least -- if
8 you're going to have closures, you've got to have one side
9 access to Logan Pass, period; got to have it.

10 And the second one was that the thinking being if
11 you had -- in order to have construction efficiency, if you
12 left one side open and closed one side, you could throw
13 everything you had at that one side for as long as you
14 wanted, or for the period of time that you were closed to
15 increase the efficiency of construction. But if you were
16 throwing everything at the other side and it was
17 concentrated on the lower end, you could should leave the
18 road open from Logan Pass down to where that construction
19 started, so people would have optimum opportunities to get
20 at it.

21 Common elements. We didn't have much to offer
22 creatively here, simply because I think we denied common
23 elements differently than the rest of the groups about. But
24 I think the rest of the groups covered a lot of common
25 elements that are good. So we just said, you know, consider

1 cost, time, safety, historic retention. There's not much
2 give there. Natural value nonimpairment. There's no give
3 there. Socioeconomics and visitor experience.

4 E, is there another alternative or alternative
5 approach that should be considered? We had a list of them.
6 Some of them are the same that you've had -- other people
7 have had.

8 Number 1, close one side at a time. We listed
9 that first because we thought it was, clearly, the way this
10 alternative should be framed, if we had this alternative.

11 One-way traffic on the road with loop connection.
12 Everybody's mentioned that one.

13 Third one was shoulder season full or half-way
14 closure. In other words, the discussion we had an
15 Alternative 4. Take those shoulder seasons, close it down
16 completely, or close one side completely.

17 And, lastly, close the west side with traffic
18 management and rehab on the east side. And, Roscoe, you
19 talked about this one. And I think your thinking was that
20 if you could close one side and also work on the second side
21 of the traffic management so people could get up to Logan;
22 is that right?

23 MR. BLACK: Well, basically, I think -- and I
24 think Barney agreed with me, that most of the alpine work
25 that has to be done on the east side could be done with the

1 alternating one-way traffic as opposed to what you encounter
2 on the west side alpine area. And I would ask Joe what your
3 take on that is.

4 MR. KRACUM: One of the problems, say,
5 between Logan Pass and Siyeh Bend is there's a lot of slope
6 stability issues. And that's an issue that I wouldn't
7 recommend seeing them alternating one-ways being a viable,
8 safe solution.

9 MR. O'QUINN: Too much scaling. You're going
10 to have to close it wherever you do that.

11 MR. KRACUM: You have to close it.

12 MR. O'QUINN: Both ways.

13 MR. KRACUM: Both ways.

14 MR. O'QUINN: But that's not what we were
15 talking about. We were talking about aside from that, the
16 roadway construction part of it, most of that you don't have
17 the extreme road one-way geometrics that you do on the west
18 side.

19 MR. KRACUM: Right.

20 MR. SENN: I would say it would be about
21 50/50. The east side had a lot more global failure. A
22 global failure means the whole slope is moving. So there
23 are more of those instances on the east side than the west
24 side. The west side had more drainage problems and a couple
25 of other things. Of that 10 percent, yes, there was some

1 scaling and there's also some rehab options that literally
2 you're going to have to take side to side of the whole road
3 at one time. And it all has to come out and all go back in.
4 Well, that 10 percent is not just taking rocks out from
5 above you where it's unsafe, it's -- there's no way to pass.
6 There's no way to throw a road back in to get a one-way. So
7 that's kind of defined by that 10 percent occupying or
8 closing the road.

9 MR. JEWETT: So in sum and in closing, we
10 thought that if we recommended that there be some sort of a
11 traffic suspension alternative, that this is not -- that
12 this is not the one, but there is a way to do it.

13 MS. TRIBE: So if you go to those
14 alternatives, additional ones that you have on your third
15 page, I think, are those sort of variations on a suspension
16 alternative?

17 MR. JEWETT: Yeah. This is -- yes.

18 MS. TRIBE: So you haven't -- you're not
19 necessarily -- except for the loop one -- you're not
20 necessarily suggesting with those others an entirely
21 different alternative. It's just different ways of looking
22 at -- I'm going to use the C word, looking at closure in one
23 place or another.

24 MR. JEWETT: With these?

25 MS. TRIBE: Except for the loop one, number

1 2.

2 MR. JEWETT: What we're saying is the current
3 suspension traffic alternative is not appropriate, as
4 structured. There are other ways to look at it, both in
5 considerations, and here are some of the ways to suspend
6 traffic that would work in this alternative.

7 MS. TRIBE: But you do think the public
8 should see a traffic suspension alternative analyzed.

9 MR. JEWETT: We felt that was what we were
10 doing in our group, was taking a look at this as an
11 alternative and figuring out how to best put it forward so
12 that it met what we were hearing.

13 MS. TRIBE: All right; other comments?

14 Thank you.

15 So the first question I'm going to ask you here is
16 not going to be do you need a break, because we'll take one
17 when we finish this.

18 If you look at all of these, and I know that you
19 can't see them and you're operating on sort of what you
20 heard and that kind of business, what observations, just
21 initially, would you make that would help us think about
22 this business of an acceptable set of alternatives?

23 Barney.

24 MR. O'QUINN: Before we go quite to that, I'd
25 like to make some comments on the Engineering Report and

1 it's regarding the alternatives, which do have bearing on
2 this.

3 MS. TRIBE: May I keep track of those up here
4 on the chart?

5 MR. O'QUINN: You sure might.

6 The first is, I do not feel like the report
7 adequately addresses the action that's taken place now.
8 There's a lot of work going on and has been going on with
9 the -- through the Federal Highway Administration contracts.
10 The report alludes to this work and makes mention of it in
11 several places. But if you're not familiar with it and
12 don't know what's happened, it just -- it's not definitive.
13 I think, in the introduction or someplace in the report,
14 there needs to be a very clear explanation of the work
15 process that's taking place, the contracts, what kind of
16 contracts they are and what contracts are left to be done
17 and how long this is going to take. A general description
18 of the ongoing work.

19 This, which you might consider heavy maintenance
20 which is beyond maintenance, but that, with Alternates 1 and
21 2, could be combined into one alternative as to planning for
22 the future work. I think the no-build alternative can be
23 dismissed very quickly, and it doesn't meet the NEPA
24 project. I think that goes without saying that there's a
25 need has been heavily established and the no-build in itself

1 would not meet that, so then you get into the incremental
2 process of minimal funding. And that would be what's going
3 on now in 1 and 2. And again, I just don't feel like that
4 there's an adequate discussion of what has taken place.

5 The second comment, and this goes somewhat
6 throughout the report, has to do with the historic
7 components. And this is a planning document that leads into
8 the environmental report. And whereas I think it's entirely
9 appropriate and should be, and you taking into consideration
10 your staff historical experts and opinions about things that
11 are important and red flags, if you will, that can be
12 avoided or should be avoided or might not be avoided, I
13 think, in some cases, you may have relied too heavily on
14 that opinion. For example, I think you've got -- and this
15 is throughout several of the alternatives. I think you make
16 the comment that the catch basins cannot be improved or
17 changed because they're contributing historic points. I
18 think the catch basins are very, very much a safety hazard.
19 I think they can be. I think, to go to the extreme that you
20 have, in some cases, with historical context, without
21 reviewing this with the appropriate resource agency, we may
22 be foreclosing some improvements that could be made and
23 might be acceptable to historic resource agencies.

24 I think the road -- and we talked about this some.
25 It's been evolving. And this goes into the things that can

1 take place from the historical context. It's been evolving
2 throughout its construction all the time that we've had it.
3 They made improvements. For example, the
4 relocation -- there's been a whole relocation section there
5 at McDonald lodge. And if you wanted to get back to the
6 original location, are we talking about going back to that?
7 I don't think we are. I think there's some areas on the
8 lower ends where the pavement's been widened. The pavement
9 could have been widened, probably, in the alpine section,
10 except for the difficulty of construction. So to try and
11 hold all of the things as is, I think might be a mistake.

12 I think -- and we haven't discussed additional
13 pullouts for drivers or parking facilities and that type of
14 thing, and I think that this is going to require a lot of
15 coordination with the historic resource agencies. And that
16 needs to be done without just precluding some of these
17 things in the alternatives.

18 And from that standpoint, I think, as I said, we
19 could combine 1 and 2. I think that 3 and 4 has been
20 discussed as a combination of alternatives. And Alternative
21 5 is really a 5A. And that gets us down -- if you're
22 looking at it that way, you're getting down to about three
23 alternatives. I don't suggest that the loop is a viable
24 alternative, but I think it's going to have to be discussed,
25 either here and dismissed for cause or in the environmental

1 document. I think the public is going to require it. I
2 think we've heard enough about it, that some analysis of the
3 loop type, and it may not be viable. When I first looked at
4 it I thought it was, and the more I looked at it, I don't
5 think it is. But I don't think we can just ignore it.

6 I think we can take the five alternatives with
7 modifications, and we can get the no-build, get rid of that
8 right quick, combined with the work that's going on now with
9 work 1 and 2, as a minimum level, 3 and 4 as a probably the
10 most logical construction without closure, and then a
11 modified 5, and then discuss maybe the loop that probably is
12 not viable, would be my recommendation.

13 MS. TRIBE: Well, Barney, I really appreciate
14 your summary. I think that's very helpful for everybody. I
15 just want to be clear before I take your comment.

16 You're saying in your mind that the work doesn't
17 adequately reflect the rehab work that's going on now. And
18 that somewhere early in the report that needs to be
19 explained; contracts that are going, when they'll be
20 finished, blah, blah, and what will be accomplished with
21 those. And that if you take that information, acknowledging
22 that 1 is a no brainer, dismiss, that we could build an
23 alternative out of this.

24 You also said that the report may have relied too
25 heavily on historic red flags, you said, and that you think

1 some collaborative discussion with historic agencies and
2 experts could lead to some solutions that are more creative
3 than what's in it; okay?

4 And then you said we might want to consider 3 and
5 4 as one alternative, some kind of, excuse me, closure
6 suspension alternative, and that whether this loop gets
7 dismissed early or has full analysis, it probably needs to
8 be an alternative. That gives us four.

9 Now, Barbara.

10 MS. PAHL: Barney, you presented a lot of
11 comments there, and the only one that I really want to
12 respond to, I'm sure this is not a shock or surprise to you,
13 is your comment about the report's priority of protecting
14 the existing historic features along the road. There will
15 be -- have to be compliance with everything before it goes
16 forward, as you well know. But for the purposes of other
17 folks here, the agency referred to, of course, is the
18 Montana State Historical Preservation Office.

19 And just as they have complied with all the work
20 being done to date, they will also be asked to review and
21 give their comments. Nothing that I say, nothing that Mark
22 says, will serve as compliance under the National Historic
23 Preservation Act. Being that the Going-to-the-Sun Road is a
24 national historic landmark and, again, whereas there's
25 probably 70,000 entries on the National Register historic

1 places, only 2,700 of those are deemed to be part of our
2 nation's history and are deemed to have national
3 significance. So this like -- this road is like the Statue
4 of Liberty. It's like Ellis Island. It's like Mount
5 Vernon, in terms of its significance, not just to this park
6 or this state, but to the country.

7 So, therefore, protecting what remains of those
8 historic features along the road is pretty important. So I
9 would say at this point, and I did have a chance to talk to
10 Joe about this when you raised the catch basin issue with me
11 yesterday, and I asked him, flat out, whether or not he felt
12 protecting that particular feature would pose a serious
13 safety issue for the public? And so from one engineer to
14 another, he felt with the remedies called for in the report,
15 it would not. So maybe it's two engineers that disagree,
16 but I'd like to carry forward as the report has, to try to
17 protect as many of the remaining features. A lot of the
18 features are gone, and we're not calling for them to be put
19 back. We're not calling for those missing stone walls to be
20 built like the old ones. We're calling for them to be built
21 with new technology so that they appear to be compatible and
22 reflect the historic character. But I think when you have
23 whatever features you have left of this road that are of a
24 historic period, should be saved.

25 MR. O'QUINN: I'm not -- and don't

1 misunderstand what I'm saying. I'm not suggesting in any
2 way to just run over the historic features. I'm saying that
3 there are some opportunities for improvements that I think
4 should not be precluded, simply -- or not simply -- but this
5 early, particularly the catch basins. I guess I disagree
6 with Joe. I think they're a real safety hazard.

7 MR. KRACUM: Can I respond?

8 MS. TRIBE: Since we're talking about you.

9 MR. KRACUM: The catch basins. Yeah, they're
10 holes in the ground. Of course they're a safety hazard.
11 And what we've recommended is the protection be put around
12 them to protect people from going in them. What we're not
13 recommending is putting in new catch basins. Anyplace where
14 we need new drainage facilities, we're recommending -- more
15 like a drop inlet like you see on the street, with a
16 protective grade upon them.

17 We were advised that the catch basins are a
18 significant historical feature. And our feeling was there
19 is a weighing between those two pieces. And protecting the
20 public from going in them is of the primary concern. And I
21 have not found many instances where people actually have
22 gone into those catch basins. So, you know, combining that,
23 no, I don't think we should put any more in, but I think,
24 you know, for all intents and purposes, save the ones you've
25 got, but protect people more from going in.

1 MR. O'QUINN: All I'm saying, Joe, is before
2 we just close that option, that that should be discussed
3 with all of the appropriate agencies.

4 MR. KRACUM: Okay.

5 MR. O'QUINN: And that's a hard line you can
6 put some protection around them, otherwise, put a grate over
7 them.

8 MS. TRIBE: There are going to be some
9 separate issues like this that are going to require a lot of
10 discussion. But at the risk of sounding like I'm doing nice
11 nice, this is the kind of thing that happens often in this
12 kind of discussion. Someone who comes to the table within a
13 particular set of parameters, we look at Barney as an
14 engineer, so Barney spoke. And what Barney actually said
15 was, I want to make sure that we don't just automatically,
16 without a lot of thought. And then when Barbara speaks,
17 because of the interest she brings to the table, we
18 automatically assume she's saying No, save every one of
19 them. And yet I heard her stand up here today and say where
20 we can face things with rock but have a more technologically
21 sound product, we want to do that.

22 But you also said that in the end, SHIPO's going
23 to have to look at it, and SHIPO's going to have to be the
24 final say in what happens, related to those actions.

25 MS. PAHL: I need to clarify what you said I

1 said. Because of our lady there recording.

2 I'm making the distinction between original
3 historic fabric and fabric that's lost, just so we're clear.
4 So using the modern technology and putting in a new wall so
5 that it looks in appearance like what was there, isn't the
6 issue. And then over here, we're saying where you have the
7 original historic fabrics there, we should protect it. At
8 the end of the day, because this is a national historic
9 landmark, SHIPO will comment, the Advisory Council on
10 Historic Preservation will comment. And even though it's
11 ironic it's the Park Service, the regulations require the
12 Secretary of Interior to comment, when it's a national
13 historic landmark. So that will be the review process that
14 will ultimately make the decisions.

15 MS. TRIBE: Barbara would you disagree with
16 Barney's comment that we ought to try to be as collaborative
17 as possible and honor the historic things that those
18 protecting agencies want to have happen, but if there's a
19 way to do it in a safer way or a sounder way and still
20 protect, let's talk about it?

21 MS. PAHL: That's what we're talking about.

22 MS. TRIBE: Would you agree with that that's,
23 I think, that's what Barney's saying.

24 MS. PAHL: And I think the disagreement is I
25 agree with his method and not his.

1 MR. JACKSON: I understand Barney's point of
2 view about 1 and 2 being the same. The only thing is that 2
3 has got a 110 million dollar higher cost than 1, and I think
4 that's real money, actually. So insofar as we're supposed
5 to be comprehensive and integrative, it's a little hard for
6 the economists here to say oh, 110 million dollars that
7 isn't significant. That, I think, is an important point.

8 The other thing that I want to point out again is
9 that from Jean's work, these two alternatives have the least
10 impact of the improvements. There's no change from the
11 baseline in her stuff. The others have 15 to 17 to 25
12 percent decreases, if that's about the right order, of
13 magnitude. And so these two here, from the standpoint of
14 why this Committee got put together, actually, have a lot of
15 bearing to what we should be thinking about. They're the
16 ones that seem to kind of -- I'm afraid of catastrophic risk
17 and other things like that, which we haven't really been
18 able to address objectively. But I mean, at face value.
19 110 million bucks is real money. This 1 and 2 alternatives
20 have the lowest impact on the losses to tourism.

21 MS. TOWNSEND: Actually, Dave just made the
22 point in his latter part of his remarks. Number 1 and
23 number 2 have less of a socioeconomic impact, assuming
24 there's no catastrophic failure. If that occurs, then the
25 socioeconomic impact for those is catastrophic and pales in

1 comparison with the others. And so that's just a variable
2 that none of us control.

3 MS. TRIBE: But that's part of the analysis
4 that the public reads in the environmental document.

5 So, Dave, are you suggesting that maybe
6 Alternative 1 stays, which is if something happens and Harry
7 calls us we go up and fix it. And then we take 2, along
8 with the current work that's going on because I'm assuming
9 that's in a planned way, that you're not denying Barney's
10 need to reflect what's happening currently, but that you'd
11 like to keep 1 and 2 separate?

12 MR. O'QUINN: That would be more with 1, I
13 think. I think if you were going to do that, you would
14 combine what's going on now with 1 and then have 2 separate.

15 MR. JACKSON: Okay.

16 MR. O'QUINN: 1 is what's going on now is
17 reactionary.

18 MS. TRIBE: So you would have Alternative 1
19 combined with the business of what's going on now, but then
20 we would also keep Alternative 2, and Jean and Dave are
21 saying these have the lowest potential socioeconomic impact,
22 unless a real bad thing happens, and those are the risks
23 that have to be written up in the document.

24 MS. BURCH: I have a question of catastrophic
25 risk failure, while we've got two or more engineers here.

1 To a certain extent, I think we forget that after this road
2 is done -- I mean, we all want to believe that the risk of
3 catastrophic failure is going to go away, once the road is
4 rehabed. And my understanding of the road is that's not
5 really possible to do that. Do you think this
6 rehab -- there are two parts of this question, so that's the
7 first one. Is our rehab going to make all risk of
8 catastrophic failure go away on Going-to-the-Sun Road?

9 MS. TRIBE: Not if there's an earthquake.

10 MR. KRACUM: It will reduce the risk,
11 certainly. It's a matter of risk management.

12 MS. BURCH: Okay; then, the other part
13 is -- and now this has bearing on the socioeconomic portion.
14 What I think of this road, and I want to verify or shoot
15 this out. The alpine section is actually fairly -- is not
16 very prone to catastrophic failure. It's the sections where
17 what I think is called the West Tunnel and the Bearing Falls
18 section where you have -- what I'm specifically thinking of
19 is when Dead Horse Curve washed out a few years ago and when
20 the section just before the Loop washed out. Those are what
21 I would call catastrophic failures, because there was no
22 lane any longer. However, what I also remember is that
23 those were fixed very quickly. And so if I'm quivering in
24 my shoes for catastrophic failure as a reason to choose one
25 or the other, what I'm seeing is the realist possibility of

1 catastrophic failure is something that can be fixed fairly
2 quickly, even though we don't want somebody to be washed
3 away. Am I making my point? Is that --

4 MR. BAKER: It's not really catastrophic.

5 MS. BURCH: Well, it is catastrophic, but
6 it's not a huge socioeconomic impact, as we think it might
7 be.

8 MR. BLACK: I might add to that that there
9 was another washout up in the alpine section, and I can't
10 remember how many years ago that happened, but very quickly
11 they put in a Bailey bridge, and traffic resumed on a
12 one-way basis up there. And we'd lost both lanes. And then
13 they went in and fixed it. Didn't economically affect us
14 that summer whatsoever. Yeah, we can't have Bailey bridges
15 all over the place. But, I think, when we start talking
16 about catastrophic failures, what really and truly are we
17 talking about here?

18 MS. TRIBE: And so both of you are kind of
19 suggesting that Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 might be
20 alternatives that we want to see analyzed. And you would
21 like catastrophic event defined better.

22 MS. BURCH: As we consider -- as we all, as
23 individuals, make our considerations of the potential
24 socioeconomic impact of a catastrophic failure, I guess I
25 would say consider our experience -- our limited.

1 MR. O'QUINN: I think, and I'm not going to
2 argue with David about his figures, but I think the
3 difference in 1 and 2 is funding levels. And the assumption
4 you're making, when you create that hundred million dollar
5 difference, is that you work in isolation on this project
6 and what it's going to cost. And what, in reality, we're
7 talking about is Congress is going to spend the money here
8 or somewhere else. It's not going to just not be spent.
9 And so it's not lost money.

10 Alternative 1 is not making any provisions for
11 where work may need to be done. Alternative 2 is planning
12 for that work and then being able to do it as funding
13 becomes available. And Alternative 1 is almost a no-build.
14 It's almost do nothing. It's the reaction completely.

15 MS. TRIBE: Within the budget they get.

16 MR. O'QUINN: Yeah. So I feel like to try to
17 justify the differences on those, on escalated cost because
18 of an additional 30 years, is kind of smoke and mirrors.
19 Because it's not money you got. If you had it, you'd go
20 ahead and do it.

21 MS. TRIBE: We've got two issues on the
22 table. We have to clean up the catastrophic event business,
23 and Roscoe was next, and then Brian had a comment, and then
24 Suzann you had a comment and then Randy.

25 So I think you're still talking about the

1 catastrophic event.

2 MR. BLACK: Yes. Your comment that my
3 approach on the catastrophic failures led to us wanting to
4 consider 1 or 2, is not exactly where I was going.

5 I just want us to know that catastrophic
6 failures -- I would like a definition on that.

7 MS. TRIBE: Okay. So it has no bearing on
8 whether 1 or 2 or combined or anything is. So we'll look
9 for a definition in just a second here.

10 Brian.

11 MR. BAKER: With regards to these past
12 failures that were called catastrophic, it may not show up
13 immediately as economic loss, but I can assure you in the
14 media releases that are portrayed to the major newspapers
15 throughout the region, including Calgary and Edmonton to the
16 north, there is a big feeling, in the last three, four
17 years, of people not wanting to drive the road because they
18 do not feel it is safe because of what they have read in the
19 past. So while it may not directly seem like it's an
20 economic loss now, you are losing money by people not
21 wanting to go over the road, therefore, they're not coming
22 to the Glacier area. And we see it all the time in
23 Waterton; we hear it all the time in Waterton. They think
24 that the road is not safe.

25 MS. TRIBE: Okay.

1 Now, both of your comments have to do with budget;
2 is that right, with catastrophic?

3 MS. LEWIS: One is the catastrophic and one
4 is to alternatives.

5 MS. TRIBE: Would you make your catastrophic
6 comment, and then I'm going to ask Joe if he would give us a
7 definition of what they're talking about.

8 MS. LEWIS: I was going to suggest that I
9 don't think it's possible to reach a definition of
10 catastrophic. Because I think as everybody comments on
11 that, it's another thing that it has different meanings to
12 everyone around this table; what would constitute
13 catastrophic for you, your business, your family, your
14 friends, and that it would be very difficult to arrive at
15 that.

16 I guess in my head is that -- and this is probably
17 one of the few things where, you know, I take keen interest
18 in this because, for me, my threshold on catastrophic is not
19 after something bad has happened on the road but our ability
20 to preclude something bad. And the federal highway
21 folks -- Mr. Carmichael's sitting here. I know I shared
22 with him when I first came here, the staff has heard me say,
23 I don't want to be the superintendent who has a failure on
24 the road and any potential loss of life associated with
25 that. We have to be able to predict that the road is safe

1 enough to be open the way it is today, or I and the staff
2 have a responsibility to take an action.

3 MS. TRIBE: Which could include closing the
4 road.

5 MS. LEWIS: Right. It could include closing
6 the road. What I don't want to be in is in a position where
7 I have to make that decision because it's a prudent thing to
8 do, but I haven't let a catastrophe occur in order to have
9 the public support me on that. So, I think, again, this is
10 something that is way all over the board, and I think would
11 be very difficult to have a consensus.

12 And can I make a comment on Alternative 1, or do
13 you want to stay with --

14 MS. TRIBE: Well, I just sort of wanted to
15 finish off with catastrophic thing first.

16 Randy, was your comment about Barney's?

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: My comment's about
18 Alternative 1.

19 MS. TRIBE: So do you want to say anything
20 about catastrophic or not, Joe?

21 MR. KRACUM: Well, I'll say a few words. It
22 does have different meanings to different people. A rock
23 the size of this table falling on a family of four is a
24 catastrophic failure to some people. The Upper Slope
25 sliding onto the road and it being closed for a week or two

1 weeks is a catastrophic failure to someone else. The whole
2 road sliding out and not being able to be fixed for two
3 years is a catastrophic failure to someone else.

4 In terms of materials, and I'm not trying to skate
5 the question so much, but in terms of material, steel,
6 concrete, plastics, it's generally fairly calculable when
7 those materials will fail. Because the way they're composed
8 has a certain homogeneous quality to it. They're massive,
9 and you can predict their failures. With rock and soils,
10 they're not. So trying to predict that's going to happen or
11 when that specifically is going to happen, is virtually
12 impossible, without extensive geotechnical instrumentation
13 everywhere that you could possibly put it.

14 I used to work in underground mining. And
15 catastrophic failures meant that the roof fell. And we used
16 to use some measuring devices to predict. But we couldn't
17 predict it with much accuracy. We can get within the same
18 year, perhaps. You know, we can design a system that after
19 20 years, this is probably going to fail. But with a system
20 that was built in the '20s and '30s, not knowing the exact
21 weathering conditions over the last 70 years or so, it's
22 very difficult to try to go there, for anyone, to say This
23 is going to fall next year.

24 MS. TRIBE: Well, we don't have a definition,
25 and we're not going to try to find one. But I think this

1 discussion has been useful and, Susie, you started it here
2 in saying Wait a minute here, we probably at least need to
3 look at what that might mean and the potentiality within
4 Alternative 1, if we do Alternative 1.

5 MS. BURCH: So to the extent that it
6 motivates all of us.

7 MS. TRIBE: Yeah.

8 And are you okay, Roscoe?

9 Now, would you go to Alternative 1.

10 MS. LEWIS: The comment I wanted to share
11 about Alternative 1 and I'm not -- is the fact that
12 Alternative 1 is less than what we're doing right now. So
13 do you really want -- does this Committee really want to
14 recommend that we go into a public process spending more
15 time and getting public comment on analyzing doing less than
16 what we're doing right now? Is that a prudent activity to
17 ask the public to go through? And that's my comment about
18 Alternative 1. And I would ask my staff if that's a correct
19 observation; that Alternative 1 represents less than what
20 we're doing right now?

21 MR. DAKIN: Is that assured, Suzann? I mean,
22 the contracts, the Loop contracts and things that have
23 happened to fix the known failures the last few years, are
24 those secure? Will that go on?

25 MS. LEWIS: No.

1 MR. DAKIN: Will the level of money that
2 you've had the last three to four years continue on
3 indefinitely?

4 MS. LEWIS: Well, none of our money is
5 continual. All of our money is subject to an annual
6 appropriation, every bit of money this Park has.

7 MR. DAKIN: So Alternative 1, does it kind of
8 reflect a baseline that you operate from now, if you didn't
9 have these special projects going on?

10 MS. LEWIS: No.

11 MR. BABB: I see the big difference between 1
12 and 2 is what Barney was saying, is 1 is not planning.
13 You're really in a reactionary mood. And what we're doing
14 with federal highway right now is, we're trying to do the
15 planning. And like Suzann said, for every dollar we get we
16 have to compete, basically, on a regional and national
17 level. But we have done the necessary planning to justify
18 the direction we're going. Under 1, there's really no
19 planning. It's just something falls off or the road drops
20 off the cliff, whatever --

21 MS. LEWIS: We would have to go and ask
22 somebody for the money.

23 MR. BABB: After an event happened though.

24 MS. TRIBE: Are you doing planning for these
25 projects that you have ongoing?

1 MS. LEWIS: Yes.

2 MS. TRIBE: And are those capital dollars or
3 your regular budget? Do you get specific --

4 MS. LEWIS: Capital dollars.

5 MS. TRIBE: So when the project's finished
6 that pocket of money is done.

7 MS. LEWIS: Done. In no aspect of any
8 operation of the federal government is there any reoccurring
9 money without an annual appropriation. So when you -- when
10 Jayne and her group talked about being concerned about the
11 national events of last week and what they might -- how they
12 might impact the annual appropriation by Congress for all
13 options of all programs in the government, that's a reality
14 that we live with. I mean, Congress always shifts its
15 priorities. And they do it every year. And it is -- I
16 think a lot of people assume that you always get what you
17 started out with. And that is absolutely not the case. The
18 Park Service has had some consistency in its operating
19 budget, the appropriations of it, but there's no guarantees
20 for that.

21 MS. TRIBE: So would we be more accurate in
22 saying Alternative 2 is more like no action? You do
23 planning, you ask for budget, you have a project, you ask
24 for money for it.

25 MR. O'QUINN: 1 is no action. Alternative 1

1 is in here as no action. And it does not meet the purpose
2 and need of the project. Alternative 2, you're planning for
3 it, it does meet the purpose and need, but it's dependent
4 upon funding.

5 MS. TRIBE: So maybe our trouble here is how
6 we define "no action." So I'm defining no action when I ask
7 the question Is nothing different than what's going on now?

8 MR. O'QUINN: 1 is less than what's going on
9 now.

10 MS. TRIBE: Barney, would you be open to
11 having a couple people respond to your comment? Because I
12 heard a couple comments back here.

13 What did you say?

14 MS. DAVIS: Alternative 2 is much closer to
15 what we're doing. It's closer to existing conditions than
16 Alternative 1. And I see Fred and Joe agreeing with that as
17 well.

18 MS. TRIBE: So if you were doing the NEPA
19 document, and you were looking at no action, would no action
20 be existing condition?

21 MS. DAVIS: No action and existing conditions
22 do not have to be the same alternative in a NEPA document.
23 You can define them that way, but you don't have to. And
24 that's why I was suggesting earlier that we don't want to
25 get into that discussion about trying to define the

1 no-action alternative.

2 MS. TRIBE: I see; all right.

3 So the question for us then is -- I'm sorry;
4 please.

5 MR. BAKER: It's very obvious that you just
6 ax Alternative 1 and replace it with no action, because
7 they're not the same.

8 MS. TRIBE: Can you live with that, Barney?

9 MR. O'QUINN: Yeah.

10 MS. TRIBE: Barbara?

11 MS. PAHL: And I can support that.

12 MS. TRIBE: And you support that also.

13 MR. O'QUINN: But alternate 2 is an action.

14 MS. TRIBE: So Alternative 1, as it's
15 written, which is less than action, as Barney's saying, is
16 reactionary, than less what the Park Service is doing now,
17 could be mentioned and dismissed early as an alternative
18 considered but we threw it out the window; right?

19 MR. BANCALE: Unless you so define it as the
20 no-action alternative.

21 MS. TRIBE: But what's been suggested here
22 then is -- let me just throw this out. That there is a no
23 action created, and that it is Alternative 2?

24 MR. O'QUINN: No.

25 MS. TRIBE: There is a no action created by

1 the writers of the document, and we have Alternative 2 with
2 the beef up that Barney was talking about. We have
3 Alternatives 3 and 4 combined, we have some kind of
4 suspension or closure alternative, and then we decide what
5 to do about this loop business.

6 MS. PAHL: And we got rid of 1.

7 MS. TRIBE: How's that sound?

8 MR. O'QUINN: 1 is really no action, and it's
9 going to cost you an extra hundred million dollars plus. If
10 you don't do anything, you're going to have to react to
11 failure. And when you react to failure, it's going to cost
12 you more.

13 MS. MOE: My question is, why would you not
14 want to define your Alternative 2 as status quo or your
15 no-action alternative? I mean, if they're that close, why
16 don't you just call them one and the same thing, and then
17 you don't even have to deal with another alternative.

18 MS. PAHL: I think as superintendent of the
19 Park, some of the no-action alternative steps could be close
20 the road. There's no funding to take care of it, it's
21 dangerous, there's at risk of catastrophic failure, so one
22 result of the no-action alternative would be the road is
23 closed. What it would do is cut up the arrested decay,
24 which is this new preservation term which I can't stand. So
25 I think under the no-action alternative, it could be a lot

1 of -- a lot could be in that discussion. And I don't think
2 we should hamstring by saying This is your no-action
3 alternative.

4 MS. TRIBE: And that's what they're
5 suggesting doing as well. They would be better served to
6 draw their own.

7 MS. PAHL: Let them address it the way we're
8 used to.

9 MS. MOE: But with having Alternative 2 as
10 your no action, status quo, whatever you want to call it,
11 would that preclude you from, if you think it's in imminent
12 danger of falling apart, being able to close the road?

13 MS. PAHL: I'm not suggesting we do that.

14 MS. MOE: No. But when you're saying all
15 those other options, does that -- by defining Alternative 2,
16 does that preclude you -- I mean, does that take away from
17 you having those options to begin with?

18 MS. PAHL: I think we should not have to have
19 this conversation, because I don't think --

20 MS. TRIBE: Well, I want to honor the comment
21 that Anna Marie had. She's asking, Does it preclude -- if
22 the no action was Alternative 2, could you then close the
23 road if you had to?

24 MS. LEWIS: Yes. In fact, you would put it
25 in an alternative that one of the impacts of that

1 alternative is that a closure could occur at any time that
2 there was a failure that you hadn't been able to plan for,
3 because you planned for something else but a catastrophic
4 failure happened somewhere else. So yes, it would be in the
5 alternative. And you would have to have a pretty honest
6 discussion that that particular alternative would probably
7 not do a lot to abate catastrophic failure in a high,
8 medium, low sense. You still would be operating at a pretty
9 high risk factor, even though you'd done lots of planning,
10 you'd done analysis. But if you've got 16 critical areas on
11 the road, let's say, or let's just say 10 are rated as being
12 really in imminent need of repair, and because of funding
13 restrictions you only get enough funding to do one or two
14 and you predict that it's going to take you 15 years to
15 address all 10, then, you know, you're going to be in a
16 high-risk situation during those 15 years for one of those
17 10 you're not working on, to have a failure, and the road is
18 closed.

19 MS. TRIBE: Does that answer your question?

20 MS. MOE: Yes; thank you.

21 MS. TRIBE: I can't remember if I left Randy
22 hanging.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: You did leave me hanging, but
24 my primary goal was to get rid of 1, and I think it's gone.

25 MS. TRIBE: So let me ask you, let me see if

1 we have agreement here; okay?

2 That Alternative 1, as it was written, less than
3 the Park Service is doing right now, we would either not
4 advance it as an alternative at all or we would ask the
5 writers of the environmental document to look at it as one
6 of those things we thought about for a about five minutes
7 and then, because of these reasons, we got rid of it. Do we
8 have agreement?

9 (No response.)

10 MS. TRIBE: Wow, trust them.

11 MR. O'QUINN: I think the caveat you need to
12 do, that is, you didn't go that far, was it might be that
13 they would want to include 1 and the economic cost
14 associated with it as the no-build alternative.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Doesn't matter. This is
16 advisory. We're not writing it for them.

17 MS. TRIBE: I guess what I'm asking is, do
18 you agree that 1 is not an alternative that we would admit?

19 MR. BAKER: We should dismiss it.

20 MS. TRIBE: However, we recognize the
21 expertise of the Park Service. And if they need to include
22 it in the discussion, particularly related to socioeconomic,
23 then they would. But we probably wouldn't find it very
24 useful as one of the main alternatives.

25 MR. BAKER: We've dismissed it.

1 MS. TRIBE: Alternative 2; and we also will
2 trust the Park Service to develop their version of no
3 action, because they're the best people to describe no
4 action, within NEPA terms, within all of that. Is that
5 okay?

6 MR. BAKER: A new no-action alternative,
7 basically, yeah.

8 MS. TRIBE: But we're trusting them to do it,
9 because they write the documents and they know they have to
10 have one. Do we have to do -- we don't have to do no
11 action.

12 MS. LEWIS: Read your Charter again.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We don't have to do it.

14 MS. TRIBE: All no action does is lay out a
15 baseline from which to analyze changes, because your
16 proposal --

17 MR. BAKER: Like the word says; no action.

18 MS. TRIBE: Then with Barney's beef-up, and
19 perhaps looking at -- and when I say beef-up, I see you
20 frowning, Barbara. The beef-up here about adequately
21 reflecting what's going on now, the planning work that's
22 going on now, blah, blah, and being very sure and creative
23 with our discussions with historic agencies, that
24 Alternative 2 gets advanced as an acceptable alternative.

25 MR. O'QUINN: That historic part that's for

1 all alternatives. So that isn't part of it. That's a
2 generic.

3 MS. PAHL: I don't know if this other
4 part -- I mean, Barney said a lot. He identified a lot of
5 comments that he had. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I
6 thought he thought somewhere in the body of this report they
7 should capture the work these being done not necessarily as
8 part of Alternative 2.

9 MR. O'QUINN: That's correct. It's closely
10 related to alternate 2.

11 MS. TRIBE: So what you said was that the
12 report does not adequately reflect the rehabilitation work
13 that's going on now.

14 MS. PAHL: Correct; but that's not part of 2.

15 MS. TRIBE: And early in the report that
16 should be written up.

17 And then you went on to say that perhaps it could
18 be combined with Alternative 2. Did you say that?

19 MR. O'QUINN: Perhaps. It's planned work
20 that's been undertaken, so it's part of what that
21 alternative would be, except it's past or ongoing.

22 MS. TRIBE: But keep Alternative 2.

23 MS. PAHL: I don't think Barney has beef-ups
24 for Alternative 2. Alternative 2 stands with the comments
25 made by the beef.

1 MS. TRIBE: And beef-up doesn't fit. So
2 we're keeping Alternative 2.

3 And I appreciate what you're doing; that's fine.

4 Based on the comments we've heard today, we will
5 combine 3 and 4, and what we'd like to see is a real sound
6 discussion of what you could do within 3 and 4.

7 Principally, the differences here have to do with time, how
8 traffic is managed, whether you cut down one year or not
9 based on those things, but we could agree with this.

10 We would agree to some version of a suspension or
11 closure alternative, because we need to have the analysis
12 and that we might even have a 5A, B, C, or we might have a 5
13 discussed in terms of, If you did this, this might happen;
14 If you did this, this might happen. But you'd like us to
15 look at the ideas that, for example, Tony and his group had
16 up here related to possible different versions of closure;
17 right? Anybody have a problem with that?

18 (No response.)

19 MS. TRIBE: Then the last thing we need to
20 decide, we need to come to agreement on, is this loop
21 business. Should it be an alternative by itself?

22 Suzann?

23 MS. LEWIS: I'd like to ask that some of the
24 consultant folks who earlier spoke to us about this
25 readdress it to us. I would agree that we've heard from the

1 public about this, and it was included in some of the
2 comments Jean collected in hers. So I do think there's a
3 perception that this would work. And I -- like Barney, I'd
4 love to hear that it would, but my gut's telling me it
5 doesn't. It sounds good, but when you actually put it
6 through a constructability analysis that it begins to lose a
7 lot of benefits. So I'd like to hear, again, what this
8 young man -- I don't remember your name, again.

9 MR. SENN: My name is Nick. And I kind of
10 had been keeping a running tab of a couple things. And I
11 think a lot of people brought up a bunch of good issues.

12 We listed out of experience the one-way direction,
13 you would get stuck, and you could be doing the entire loop
14 and maybe have a three or four-hour direction travel if you
15 were staying on one side of the Park or the other. We were
16 thinking about oversized vehicles, RVs. You could be almost
17 eliminating them from the Park in their entirety, because
18 you couldn't pass them through the Park now because of the
19 one-way direction. I think one-way direction or a one-way
20 operation on this magnitude, you would create construction
21 access problems. Getting those concrete trucks up to a pour
22 on top would be overly complicated, because it would have to
23 flow with the one direction with the rest of the traffic a
24 lot of times, if you're not going to be stopping that
25 traffic to let something go the opposite way. And that's

1 what you're trying to avoid, is maintain some constant flow.

2 So that might actually be another reason to increase cost.

3 You know, just quickly, we did have some very big

4 concerns about emergency access and maintenance. The

5 project that I was telling you about, we -- literally, we

6 have two sides of a valley. State Highway 2 runs down one

7 side, there's a small county road on the other side that

8 we're using as a detour. When we are directing traffic on

9 this road and there's an accident, you know, it's

10 catastrophic. It blocks that road for a day at a time. We

11 had a truck tip over, we had a bus go off the road. Those

12 events change everything. You have to pull stakes and pull

13 the entire operation. You go back to your same traffic

14 configurations. So there would be some problems with that,

15 because I don't know -- the best way to describe this job

16 is I always tell people this isn't a conventional highway

17 project. It's not a big, long -- not a long project, it's

18 not horizontal construction. It's more like vertical

19 construction. It's more like a building. You can't get to

20 the 14th floor until the 11th and 12th are done. So a lot

21 of this stuff is all dominos that have to be stacked up on

22 one another.

23 I think another important point is a breakout of

24 the work. The alpine section is 50 percent of the cost in

25 whatever alternative you do. So 50 percent of the work is

1 at the top. About 20 percent would be on the
2 west -- roughly speaking, 20 percent would be on the west
3 side and more like 30 percent on the east side. So in this
4 packaging that we do, we try to take chunks of this 50
5 percent and combine it with some of the things at the lower
6 ends. It kind of leads to Tony's thoughts that, I think,
7 any of these alternatives you could go to one side of the
8 Park or the other type of construction. That would be a
9 variation to anything you did.

10 So whatever alternative you lean towards, your
11 packaging of projects, whether you're in the year two or
12 year seven, you're working on stuff on this side of the
13 alpine, on the west side of alpine. So the lower west work
14 that has to be done, I think that would be an appropriate
15 way. And that's kind of the way we were thinking; that any
16 alternative chosen would be packaged in that manner. Not
17 necessarily that both sides of Logan Pass would be closed.

18 Again, somebody mentioned different experience.
19 You know, if you were on that outside lane you're looking
20 over the side. The passenger looking down the hill
21 definitely has a different experience than being crammed up
22 against the side. We were just trying to brainstorm as many
23 of these ideas of the loop that we kind of disliked and
24 accessing areas within the Park you might have to go out of
25 direction for great distances to get someplace. That could

1 be 10 minutes in the opposite direction.

2 MR. JEWETT: Did you consider the cost
3 savings of having half as many or a third as many or
4 three-quarters as many private vehicles on the road on an
5 average day, what that would mean, in terms of your ability
6 to get the job done quicker? I mean, it seems to me -- the
7 reason I ask that question is, it seems to me comprehensive
8 shared views is where we're probably going to be heading,
9 anticipates controlling primarily the same volume of private
10 vehicles. But if you have half as many private vehicles, if
11 you control, under comprehensive shared views, what are the
12 costs savings? How much time do you save?

13 MR. SENN: I would say that you would see
14 some production increases. You would see some minimization
15 in your traffic control operations. And some of these, 3, 4
16 and 5 are pretty extensive in the amount of traffic control
17 money. That you're sending flaggers and coordinating
18 different projects. So the complexity would definitely be
19 different, if you could reduce the number of cars.

20 MR. JEWETT: I want to follow up on this. I
21 think the range of alternatives gets at the stark
22 trade-offs. But I think that comprehensive shared views is
23 way underutilized, far too underutilized, far too exploited
24 alternatives that be can broken into alternatives that
25 integrate things like extensive mass transit that bring lots

1 of people up that road at one time, which requires less
2 traffic control management, less time closed, which might
3 translate to cost savings, more construction time, less
4 trade-offs on shoulder seasons. I'm not saying it will, but
5 I'm saying these are questions that have not been, in my
6 view, explored to the extent that they need to be.

7 MR. SENN: I think, for the most part, I
8 would entirely agree with that you by reducing those
9 volumes, you will drastically -- not drastically, but there
10 will be a percentage change. And I think -- and time also.
11 I wouldn't disagree, but I think we tried to level the field
12 and just assume that volumes wouldn't be -- there were so
13 many options in the transportation visitor use to go through
14 in all these different alternatives, that you create a kind
15 of giant, confusing matrix of different ways to plug in
16 things and equations if you go into taking cars off the
17 road.

18 MR. JEWETT: And I hear you completely.
19 However, we are struggling with costs, we are struggling
20 with visitor experience, we are struggling with impact to
21 local communities, and I think we are obligated to paint
22 that matrix and to explore those options in order to try to
23 get the right balance here. Otherwise our choices are too
24 stark.

25 MS. TRIBE: So let me ask you a question,

1 based on what you've just said. Are you suggesting that
2 mass transit be considered and analyzed in a stronger way in
3 all the alternatives, or is your comment about mass transit
4 in support of looking at this loop alternative?

5 MR. JEWETT: I'm trying to knock us into a
6 different discussion level of discussion right now, frankly.
7 And the discussion is this. Is that we're headed for
8 comprehensive shared use, is my guess; okay? I don't think
9 there's one answer to comprehensive shared use. I think
10 there may be multiple answers. And I don't think that in
11 the document that I've seen, that we've looked at all of
12 this. And I think, in my view, we ought to ask How much
13 time, how much cost savings in comprehensive shared use
14 happens if we exploit it? As an example, ways of moving
15 people in blocks up that road.

16 MS. TRIBE: So when people talked here in
17 presenting 3 and 4, more than one group suggested that mass
18 transit be included as an important thing to be discussed.
19 That needs to be added to the alternatives. And that's what
20 you're seeking.

21 MR. JEWETT: We agreed to look at it in terms
22 of cost savings and time savings.

23 MS. BURCH: I concur with Tony that it would
24 be great to catapult this discussion onto, really, flushing
25 out what I think number 3, comprehensive shared use,

1 probably looks like to us too. And I think that's
2 interesting that it would save costs in engineering. I
3 would say, though, that I looked at the transportation plan
4 fairly carefully, and they were talking about 3-percent
5 reduction as -- I mean, by the way I pencil it out, and
6 granted I may need a little math correction there, but being
7 fairly aggressive. And to get to the kind of mass transit
8 that you're talking to make even a 10, 25, surely a 50,
9 you're talking about several dozen Wal-Mart sized parking
10 lots. And then you start talking about those capital costs,
11 and you would begin to see that they offset the construction
12 costs and would be much longer lasting. So I don't want to
13 put the kibosh on -- the whole idea of mass transit is
14 something I'm happy to entertain. But I just don't think
15 that's the only one that should be considered here, as we're
16 looking for good things about supplementary information for
17 Alternative 3.

18 MR. KRACUM: A couple of things. With
19 regards to traffic management using the kinds of concepts
20 Tony's talking about, about what I see alluding to getting
21 some cars off the road, use some other kind of system, Nick
22 deals with that on a daily basis. Because in the corridor
23 that he works, mass transit in 1993 took a great shot and
24 made it a priority. And we deal with that -- Nick deals
25 with that on a daily basis, on how to give them priority.

1 So there are ways to do that. And we can get into those
2 details, if you'd like. But I need to back you all up for a
3 minute.

4 Because we are at a planning level document. The
5 only way to answer a lot of your questions, Tony, and in
6 fact, some of the questions that other people have been
7 asking, is to do the design, to actually do the design work
8 and work those pieces in there. Because each year the
9 construction effort's going to be different. Each year some
10 of the traffic control's going to be different. And I think
11 what we're looking at is throwing out basic concepts for how
12 to alternatively construct this, get guidance back from you,
13 and then once we go through that EIS process and you get
14 into the design, then to use those guidelines in the design
15 process.

16 I mean, if this were to represent the design
17 project, where we are right now represents about that much
18 paper. We're very, very early. So to try to analyze, Tony,
19 all the different matrixes that -- and all the different
20 scenarios of what can happen, we've got to look at all 234
21 sites. And that's an impractical kind of thing to do at
22 this time. You need to get into the design to determine
23 whether, for instance, on those drawings, are we going to
24 take the full width of pavement out for this particular
25 area, or are we going to be able to take half of it out and

1 use some kind of structure to rebuild it? That's going to
2 tell us what kind of specific traffic control management
3 scheme we're going to use. At this time it's almost
4 impossible. We could be analyzing for the next 10 years and
5 not come up with all the right answers. But once you get
6 into design, that's when you're going to have those answers.

7 The guidance is what I think the Park Service and
8 us are looking for at this point. What is going to be
9 palatable to you, in general terms, and then let the
10 designers and the construction people that actually do that,
11 work that through on an individual project and an individual
12 year basis.

13 Make sense?

14 MR. JEWETT: Somewhat.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Joe made, far better than I
16 could have, part of my point, which is that I think Tony's
17 points, while good, are a few steps down the road and beyond
18 our mission here today. And particularly with regard to our
19 mission of recommending rehabilitation alternatives to the
20 Park Service. So what I guess I'd like to do is finish the
21 discussion of alternatives.

22 Nick was responding to a question about the loop
23 alternative, and then we got redirected into this other
24 discussion. And it sounded like Nick's comments didn't make
25 the loop alternative all that feasible as a rehabilitation

1 alternative.

2 MS. TRIBE: So I'd like to go back there,
3 too, but I want to honor Tony's comments. And I think what
4 you're saying, just to close it, is you want to make sure
5 that in terms of cost and time savings, we look at mass
6 transit within the alternatives, and you want to see that as
7 part of the analysis. That's what you said; is that right?

8 MR. JEWETT: Basically. I guess what I said
9 was that comprehensive shared use -- what I would like to
10 see looked at is reducing the number of vehicles on what are
11 the cost savings what are the time savings of reducing the
12 number of vehicles.

13 MS. TRIBE: You don't want to say
14 let's -- and actually, Lowell just pointed at Alternative 4,
15 and that's exactly what this group had suggested in common
16 elements for the alternatives.

17 So I'm going to sort of take the last comment and
18 then I'm going to go back, as we need to make a decision on
19 the loop business, and we have about three minutes to do it.

20 MS. PAHL: This comment's related to the loop
21 business. What if we, rather than require a loop and make
22 it an alternative, we, as a mitigation, which I know we're
23 going into at the end of the afternoon, we look at ways to
24 encourage the loop idea to help take traffic off the road?
25 So it doesn't mean that it means if people will decide the

1 direction they're going to go because we won't require it,
2 but we will suggest to them it's kind of a wonderful way of
3 seeing the Park. In part of what our presenter yesterday
4 talked to us about, educational issues and wildlife issues
5 that could be constructed there.

6 The part that -- the Blackfeet apparently is
7 thinking of doing a scenic byway for Highway 49, which would
8 be very cool and might include a lot of wonderful Native
9 American interpretations. So what if, rather than require
10 it, we just incent? We create it as a wonderful incentive.
11 We work with the tribe, work with this other group with
12 their enhancement along Highway 2 so that when you package
13 out to folks coming, you recommend a wonderful way to
14 experience Glacier, especially if you're in your car, is
15 this loop idea. And then they can pick the direction they
16 want to go.

17 MS. TRIBE: What do you think?

18 MR. DAKIN: I like that very much. Because,
19 really, the problem was telling us there there's nothing
20 wrong with the loop, the problem is the one-way. The
21 one-way is the problem. And I understand it. That was
22 helpful. Staging's a nightmare, constructability's a
23 nightmare, cost is a nightmare. So I don't want to
24 recommend to the Park Service that they consider the loop as
25 one of the alternatives, but I do think that they should

1 have a two or three-page statement of what Nick just told us
2 of why it isn't in the -- on the menu.

3 MS. TRIBE: Dave?

4 MR. JACKSON: The other thing that came out
5 in our group that hasn't been discussed was that maybe after
6 construction, a loop is even smart. It is, truly, you're
7 not going to have trucks coming up there with cement, and
8 it's true that you might still want to have emergency
9 vehicles coming up against traffic flow. But it might be
10 sensible, and this is the argument, anyway, following
11 construction, to have a one-way loop and more fully expand
12 the cart.

13 And Tom makes that argument more forcefully than I
14 do, but I think maybe that's part of the other discussion
15 that could be considered in this context of the loop.
16 Because I think -- you know, I think it's the most radical
17 departure, but it might be good. It's hard to imagine that
18 because it's out of the way we think. But it might be
19 really good.

20 MS. ANDERSON: I just have a question, again,
21 on the loop Highway 89 and 49 and 2. They're not really in
22 the Park, are they? So can we do anything with them?

23 MS. TRIBE: I'm starting to get real nervous
24 about where we're going, because then do we need to take a
25 look at where we've got picnic areas and Barbara's comment

1 about -- did you say incenting people?

2 MS. PAHL: We're just incenting.

3 MS. TRIBE: Rather than analyzing this as a
4 full alternative, especially when we think about, Tom, if
5 you talk about a loop, eventually, to me, that's sort of
6 redesign and strategic planning for the Park more than it is
7 engineering alternatives.

8 So, Barbara, what you're saying is, rather than
9 assessing traffic management through the loop, let's try to
10 encourage people to think about other ways to see the Park,
11 which also goes to Tony's comments about mass transit.
12 Because this is sort of like trying to put a square peg in a
13 round hole in some ways. It's a traffic management way,
14 unless you're talking strategically about how you're going
15 to manage traffic in the future. And that's not your job.

16 MR. BLACK: One of the things we should all
17 be aware of is that 70 percent of the people using
18 Going-to-the-Sun highway enter from the west side. Of that
19 75 percent that come in on the west side, 65 percent go back
20 out the west side. Only 25 percent come in on the east
21 side. And of the 25 percent that come in on the east side,
22 85 percent go out the west side. So we're talking about a
23 loop, and we're going right against all the traffic and all
24 whatever's happening right now.

25 MR. MCDONALD: Well, you know, I'm a

1 recreation planner. And you'll notice when I go out on that
2 golf cart I'm not going to backtrack, I'm going in a loop.
3 But that's a classic example. I don't mean to joke about
4 that, but typically, you never want people to backtrack.
5 They enjoy their experience more when they don't have to do
6 that. And that's a fact.

7 So what I got out of his presentation was that,
8 right now, that he was just brainstorming the analysis right
9 now. So to me, none of my answers or none of my questions
10 are answered.

11 MS. TRIBE: So are you saying you would like
12 to see this analysis in the environmental document?

13 MR. MCDONALD: Uh-huh.

14 MS. TRIBE: I keep going back to Suzann's
15 last comment. Jean -- we heard it from the public. Jean
16 heard it in some places. There are a few people here that
17 are kind of close to the idea, and so remember, just because
18 it's analyzed in the environmental document does not mean
19 that it's in. It just helps the people who thought it might
20 be a good idea decide, one way or the other, about whether
21 it's a good idea.

22 So the question we have to answer here is not
23 whether a loop's a good idea, it's whether it needs to be
24 analyzed in the environmental document as part or all of an
25 alternative. And, Randy, you're up.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: It seems a lot more like a
2 traffic flow, traffic management concept to be analyzed. It
3 doesn't seem to me to be a road rehabilitation option and,
4 therefore, it doesn't seem to me to address our mission. So
5 I don't think we should put it in as a rehabilitation
6 option, but that doesn't preclude analyzing it for future
7 traffic flow, traffic management purposes.

8 MS. TRIBE: So maybe it would go as part of
9 5.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Just leave it out; let the
11 Park Service deal with it in the future. I don't think it
12 should be a traffic management.

13 MR. MCDONALD: I think there's lots of issues
14 that -- some of the people are raising issues of parking and
15 part of the rehabilitation parking areas. And if you look
16 and you study this as a one-way scheme in a loop system,
17 then a lot of your parking problems are also solved by
18 having one-way traffic up there. So it goes -- it does fall
19 within rehabilitation of the road, I think. Because there's
20 those kinds of issues.

21 MR. O'QUINN: I think that from the very
22 beginning, I thought this had some opportunities. But I
23 think it really has more opportunities after construction
24 than it does during construction. There are all kinds of
25 problems with trying to create this. But for us to sit here

1 and start talking about the state highway system going to a
2 one-way system, I don't think that's logical. I think you
3 could conceive of it being a one-way type of loop from the
4 Park's standpoint, but you're still going to have two-way
5 traffic on the state highway system. And that being said, I
6 think there needs to be, in the environmental document or in
7 this document, an analysis. But I don't think we should be
8 telling the Park Service to carry it all the way through as
9 a feasible improvement alternative. They need to address it
10 to the point they either carry it through or dismiss it.

11 I think what Barbara has said about an incentive
12 or making it known and having reasons to use it, is an
13 excellent idea. And it gives that
14 don't-go-back-the-same-way-you-came opportunity, if somebody
15 tells you you can do that and it's something there to see.
16 And that doesn't really get outside of the Park's mission.
17 I mean --

18 MS. TRIBE: And it's a starting place for the
19 notion.

20 MR. O'QUINN: And lets you know that the east
21 side is here.

22 MS. TRIBE: I want to use about the next 60
23 seconds to come to agreements, and then we're finished.

24 MS. LEWIS: On the loop concept, my basic
25 assumption on that for wanting to have the discussion we've

1 just been having, was coming from a basis that it was not a
2 rehabilitation alternative. Because we can't turn highways
3 that we don't manage into one-way driving. But I guess I
4 was listening to it as -- what are those called, Jean,
5 visitor development activities?

6 MS. TOWNSEND: Strategies.

7 MS. LEWIS: Was to encourage the scenic drive
8 that is a loop that is not against how people go but that,
9 you know, when you leave the Park, depending on which
10 direction you go, you're missing all of Highway 2, 49, 89,
11 which are adjoining, gorgeous, adjacent pieces to the Park.
12 So I saw it as a visitor development strategy that we would
13 not want to lose as part of what would be mitigation that's
14 added into each alternative. But that's how I thought it
15 had its best ability to be captured and utilized in this
16 process, but not as a rehabilitation alternative.

17 MS. PAHL: I think that's exactly what I
18 thought I said.

19 MS. TRIBE: It is.

20 MR. BAKER: I think we should put it where it
21 was first asked. And it is a traffic management issue
22 within the alternative, and that's where we put it. It was
23 not called a loop, I don't believe we said anywhere in
24 there, because we wanted to keep it within the Park. That's
25 why we said one-way.

1 MS. TRIBE: So in every alternative, explore
2 one-way traffic where it's useful.

3 MS. LEWIS: As a traffic management.

4 MR. BAKER: But it's a traffic management
5 issue within Alternative 4. And it needs to be further
6 investigated.

7 MS. TRIBE: And you have it on here.

8 MR. JACKSON: The related can of worms where
9 the one-way thing after the rehabilitation is, you could
10 carry different size vehicles on it than you can now, which
11 certainly has different economic impacts. If it was
12 one-way, you could put great big rigs on that road. I don't
13 particularly like that idea, but that certainly has got
14 economic implications. Because lot of people come with the
15 big rig that can't get up the pass.

16 MS. TRIBE: Now, we're talking about general
17 management of the Park in the strategic sense. So here's
18 what I think we've agreed to.

19 Number one, the first agreement related to this
20 business of one-way traffic, Alternative now 3 and 4, group
21 one of the groups, asked if you would investigate the
22 business of one-way traffic as a traffic management scheme
23 in the analysis. The second thing we've said about it is
24 that we might -- I really like that word incenting. I've
25 heard of incentivising. That we could incent people going

1 over the top or riding in somebody else's vehicle or
2 whatever, but meaning mass transit, but that we'll look at
3 it again in mitigation measures. Is that okay?

4 Anybody in the room have heartburn at this point,
5 I mean, other than just your normal heartburn, so could we
6 say So far so good knowing that tonight, or we hope tonight,
7 we're going to be able to give you typed-up versions of what
8 we think you agreed to in your recommendations and you'll be
9 able to look at them one more time tomorrow?

10 Very nice job. Very nice job. You only went 30
11 minutes over, and I think that's amazing.

12 MR. JEWETT: What did we do on Alternative
13 number 5?

14 MS. TRIBE: We asked them if they would do
15 some kind of a closure or suspension alternative, and
16 whether they did it looking at 5A, 5B, 5C, the things you
17 recommended. Remember when you had your other alternatives
18 to be looked at? But that they did a much fuller job in
19 looking at Alternative 5 based on what your recommendations
20 were.

21 MR. JEWETT: Are we done with that
22 conversation?

23 MS. TRIBE: Do you want to have more?

24 MR. JEWETT: Well, no and yes.

25 MS. TRIBE: That's sort of schizophrenic.

1 MR. JEWETT: Frankly, the road closure
2 alternative that we had agreed upon back as a group, back in
3 September, was the one side that we would use that as a
4 baseline.

5 MS. TRIBE: Here's what you recommended in
6 your group. That it's very poorly defined and that you need
7 a much better defined version of it, whatever it is. And
8 that you don't have any disagreement with 5, as long as it's
9 flushed out, well defined, and that you analyze the business
10 of optimum construction efficiency and that you also look at
11 the potential of closing one side and that traffic
12 management alternatives include these. Those are the things
13 you said.

14 MR. JEWETT: One more.

15 MS. TRIBE: And these were the other
16 alternatives in there, sort of looking at traffic management
17 within it: Close one side at a time; maybe consider one-way
18 traffic, same as 4 said; shoulder season, full or halfway
19 closure. That these were things you wanted considered. I
20 wasn't looking at these as individual alternatives. I was
21 looking at these as alternative things that could be
22 assessed within 5.

23 MR. JEWETT: The purposes of this
24 discussion -- I know everybody wants to stop and get up. I,
25 for one, don't understand why, as a group, we reached

1 consensus a year ago on this issue, in terms of developing a
2 baseline alternative, and that alternative was not included
3 in the alternatives.

4 MS. TRIBE: You'll have to ask that question.

5 MR. JEWETT: And I think it should be.

6 Because I think that the largest block of public sentiment
7 comment, I think, that the state papers and, I think, the
8 businesses have, all reinforced the notion that we at least
9 ought to have a discussion on doing it quick. And I would
10 hate, as a group, to walk away from here without some sort
11 of clearer direction on what that means to people preparing
12 this document.

13 MS. TRIBE: So could we get an answer to
14 Tony's question, which is, Why do we not have that? I'm not
15 familiar with the baseline alternative that you're talking
16 about, so I'm real ignorant here. But why isn't that in the
17 alternative?

18 MR. KRACUM: In a general sense, that's what
19 Alternative 5 is; reclose a segment of the roadway.
20 Depending on how you package the work, and we didn't say one
21 side or the other side. But the package that we looked at
22 as one of the initial packages was going down from Logan
23 Pass, down Siyeh Bend, which is essentially the east side.
24 The type of traffic control and so forth is basically the
25 same, except that you allow the traffic to go all the way

1 back and forth. It doesn't actually go up to the top on one
2 side and go back and forth all the time on one side. So in
3 essence, we feel that Alternative number 5 did address that
4 closure or suspension of traffic type of scenario.

5 MR. O'QUINN: Joe, you also, in 5, happened
6 to open the road every weekend. And is that a prudent thing
7 to do?

8 MR. KRACUM: It's a tough one. And it's
9 dependent on the type of work and so forth. Now, we
10 did -- we didn't include it as a specified alternative. But
11 under that Alternative 5, in the alternatives chapter, we
12 did show what it would be, what the cost and time would be
13 if you did shut down between, I believe it was, Avalanche
14 and Sun Point. And what kind of time frame and what kind of
15 cost you would experience within that scenario.

16 MR. O'QUINN: I think what we were talking
17 about is you got a closure where it's closed for a long
18 period of time, 24-7, and then at different places. And
19 then a subset of that might be Okay, that's not acceptable,
20 but would it be acceptable to have that? But you've got
21 your three-day weekend that you've got traffic back and
22 forth all the way through. Now, what? Are you adding in
23 time of construction and the cost to do that? I think
24 that's the unknown here. I think it's substantial.

25 MR. KRACUM: I didn't quite understand your

1 question.

2 MR. O'QUINN: The baseline that we were
3 talking about, Tony was talking about, is that if the
4 contractor has complete use of a segment of road 24 hours a
5 day, seven days a week.

6 MS. TRIBE: For how long.

7 MR. O'QUINN: For however long that we
8 specified, whatever. The alternate 5, as you presented, he
9 does not have that 24-7 because the weekends have to be
10 opened so that traffic can go back and forth, which is, I
11 think, a subset of that. And I don't know the difference in
12 cost and time we're talking about.

13 MR. SENN: Joe, we have that, actually. It's
14 in the Executive Summary on page 6, literally, if you
15 were -- I think that's what Joe was trying to allude to. If
16 you were to shut down the road from Avalanche to Sun Point,
17 65- to \$78,002,000, and it would take approximately five
18 years. So that would be the shut down, no one goes in of
19 the contract between those two dates.

20 MS. TRIBE: And, Barbara, you've been waiting
21 and waiting. Please being go ahead.

22 MS. PAHL: I guess I'm really speaking to
23 both of the comments that both of you made. When we met the
24 very first time, everybody came in the room and said Don't
25 use the word "close." Don't close the road, Don't close the

1 road. And then we got into this, and a lot of them said
2 Close the road, do it quick. Now, I think that maybe this
3 alternative ought to be a tougher close the road and do it
4 quick, which maybe, then, would show less money in a shorter
5 time. Right now, it's a little bit of a combination, so it
6 doesn't show it saves a lot of money. It doesn't seem to
7 save a lot of time. And you all can think about it, because
8 we're the ones that said Don't use the C word; no C word.

9 But maybe given what the public has said in the
10 work that Jean did, this ought to be an alternative that's
11 pretty rigorous about closure. And if, for example, you
12 can, if you're up there working on the road up to Sun Point,
13 people can drive that far. But if you need it closed from
14 point A to point B and work 24 hours a day and you're going
15 to get it done in three years, we ought to give it to them
16 as an alternative.

17 MS. LEWIS: Tony's comment refers us back to
18 the recommendations from the meeting almost a year ago,
19 September of 2000. And the recommendation on -- it's a
20 range of traffic management options to be considered in the
21 engineering alternative says restrict one side. And we
22 defined restricting one side as closure of a portion of the
23 road until reconstruction is complete on that portion,
24 baseline only.

25 And I interpreted that, Tony, to be included in

1 Alternative 5, which is where Alternative 5 is looking at
2 closures. And remember I got into asking that yesterday,
3 what's a closure? Not west entrance to east entrance, but
4 it could be closure of one segment, a portion of a segment,
5 or several segments, depending on what the design would show
6 that you would do. So I think we have met the restriction
7 of one side. But, again, I think I agree with Joe that once
8 we get into the detail, then we could see from the traffic
9 management side how that would actually look.

10 MS. TRIBE: And that sort of takes us back to
11 something Joe said earlier. And I'm not trying to -- I'm
12 yours 'til midnight tomorrow night. I'll stay with you all
13 night; I don't care. I'm not trying to get out of here
14 early, but I think we might be talking about some things
15 that are going to hinder the analysis of the alternatives,
16 if we get too tight on it.

17 What I was looking at, the name of this, this is
18 called the Road Segment Closures Alternative. And what this
19 means is that you use -- excuse me for using the C
20 word -- you use closures in one way or another to accomplish
21 your job. And the purpose of the analysis of that
22 alternative approach is that, I'm assuming, if I was writing
23 that part on that alternative, I would look at it a number
24 of different ways. And the public would be able to see the
25 impacts of closing it and getting it done in two years

1 versus the closing it that they presented getting it done in
2 five years. I think we're trying to --

3 MS. PAHL: Eight years.

4 MS. TRIBE: Excuse me, eight years. I think
5 we're trying to step into things that belong in the
6 analysis, where what you've been sort of asked is, Will you
7 tell us the alternatives that you want to see further
8 assessed or further analyzed.

9 Now, I've got people ahead of you, Jayne; I'm
10 sorry. I've got Joe and then I've got Brian, and Randy also
11 I have to check because I always forget you. Were you
12 waiting?

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: No. I appreciate you
14 checking.

15 MR. KRACUM: Page 134 of the Engineering
16 Report, the very last paragraph in there, we feel that the
17 best you can do is a five-year project. I don't think we
18 can get it done any sooner than that. And in there I also
19 say that the estimated cost of rehabilitation would be in
20 the range of 65- to 78 million.

21 MR. JEWETT: That's doing what?

22 MR. KRACUM: Doing closing between Avalanche
23 and Sun Point for five years. We like to think that we
24 could just keep throwing money and everything gets shorter.
25 But you get to a point where you can't get that much up

1 there. You can't get that many people, you can't get that
2 much traffic. Even if you close it, we're still looking at
3 five years.

4 MR. JEWETT: Can I just make a very
5 quick -- that is very important for the public to know. And
6 that's exactly why I think we need to have this alternative.
7 Because when you have state papers editorializing, you have
8 huge chunks of the public saying Do it now, do it quick, get
9 it done, you better define what "quick" is. That's what
10 makes our shared comprehensive better.

11 MR. KRACUM: We didn't make eight full
12 alternatives because of the sensitivity of closing the road.
13 But I do have the numbers. We do have some analysis on it,
14 and we do have the time and cost.

15 MS. TRIBE: Let me ask you a question. Do
16 you want to see that as a full flushed-out alternative?

17 MR. O'QUINN: Yes.

18 MR. DAKIN: Yes.

19 MS. LEWIS: What is that you're talking
20 about?

21 MS. TRIBE: I'm talking about the writers of
22 the document who had the thing early in the document that
23 says These are all the alternatives that we looked at; these
24 are the ones that we dismissed for these reasons; We're not
25 going to carry it further. I'm asking if you want it there

1 or do you want it fully flushed out as these others?

2 MS. LEWIS: And we're talking about the loop,
3 and we've left Alternative 5?

4 MS. TRIBE: We're talking about the titus
5 baseline closure alternative, the five-year deal.

6 MS. KREMENIK: My comment was in agreement
7 with Barb and Tony. And because of what we've learned from
8 the socioeconomic study, that this is what people want, that
9 this is something that maybe can be brought to the front of
10 the report than was here, because there's more emphasis put
11 on this number. Because in the General Management Plan, the
12 closure method is what, two to three years and the smallest
13 possible amount. So there's quite a bit of difference
14 between that. And I think that's what business people had
15 in their minds when people say Close it, do it quick.
16 They're thinking two years, close, bang. And that's not
17 what this says.

18 MR. BAKER: Just to expand on what Jayne
19 said, a lot of what I was going to say was that. And the
20 other thing is what were people actually basing their
21 comment on when they said Do it now, do it quick. Because
22 when we first talked about road closure last year, it was
23 not specifically articulated as to what that meant; okay?
24 The new one, the road segment closure, is just an offshoot
25 of what we were talking about. Only now it's zeroed in on

1 open weekends, open nights. It was not clearly defined last
2 year as to what we really meant by "road closure." We just
3 said Close the road; how? When? Why? You know, at what
4 time? Now, it is being defined. So I still think that
5 we're coming onto our baseline, but it's just in a more
6 definitive way. And I don't think that the public really
7 knew that when they made those comments Do it now, do it
8 quick. It's like Jayne said, maybe they thought it was in
9 two years and it was going to be all over.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I just wanted to clarify how
11 we're going to handle this total closure issue. Are we
12 going to set it out there as a separate alternative, or are
13 we going to have it as part of the discussion of 5?

14 MS. TRIBE: Should it be number 6 or should
15 it be within the discussion of 5?

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think, for my input, as a
17 follow-up, I think it either ought to be discussed as a part
18 of 5 or, if it's going to be set out as a separate
19 Alternative 6, then I would suggest and support the notion
20 that it was considered but dismissed, as 1 was.

21 MR. O'QUINN: Mine relates to that. I think,
22 in the great scheme of things of 5, it has to do with
23 closure; okay? 5, as addressed in the document now, talks
24 about 4 and 3. You've got segments closed but open during
25 the weekend. Now, what you addressed was closing all the

1 way from Avalanche to Rising Sun; is that correct -- Sun
2 Point; okay. That falls under the category of 1, because
3 that completely closes off Logan Pass from both directions
4 for the entire time.

5 I think the concept that we had talked about was
6 not giving you that much road to work on, as the first
7 segment. I think you could break that into two parts; one
8 on the east side going up to Logan Pass and keeping the west
9 side open to Logan Pass, and the reverse, working the west
10 side and keeping it open. I think that's the alternative
11 we're talking about, not taking the whole alpine section out
12 and saying we're going to close that for five years. That's
13 going to change your five years; I understand that. But I
14 think that combination is what the public is going to want
15 to understand, is what are we talking about? Are we going
16 to keep it closed during the week for eight years, or are we
17 going to keep it closed all the way through there for five
18 years, or are we going to keep it closed part of the way for
19 six or seven years? And then I think it can all fall out
20 where it does.

21 MS. TRIBE: So can folks like Tony and
22 Barbara and Jayne, and people that are seeking this as
23 alternative status, could we take this baseline business, as
24 Barney described it, from the agreement that you wrote out,
25 could we analyze it as part of Alternative 5; Alternative 5

1 being an approach -- a closure approach?

2 MS. PAHL: Yes.

3 MS. TRIBE: You know, what else happens with
4 that, is that this woman over here, who we think will make
5 the decision but we really know there are a lot of other
6 people who are going to help her do it. But in the end, we
7 want her to have the best analysis possible so she can look
8 at it. Because her final decision might not be Alternative
9 3. It might be Alternative 3 here, pull in this matter of
10 5. But what we want to make sure is that she's got the best
11 analysis possible.

12 So if you really want this analyzed, it might work
13 better to compare it against other closure approaches so
14 that she really has some understanding of what you're
15 talking about here. So can you live with it as part of 5
16 rather than 6? Everybody who can, please stand up.

17 (All but three stand up.)

18 MS. TRIBE: Linda and Tony are the two that
19 didn't stand, and Tom you didn't stand.

20 MR. JEWETT: I'm not saying we can't live
21 with it, I just don't understand what we're doing.

22 MR. BLACK: Can I make one comment here about
23 we're jumping forward saying everybody wants the public
24 opinion, et cetera, et cetera. And I'm looking at this and
25 saying that 56 of the people who responded in the business

1 side of it said that the reconstruction or rehabilitation is
2 not going to affect their gross sales. So those people are
3 saying Go ahead, just do whatever the hell you want and get
4 it done; okay? The people who are really going to be
5 impacted by it are the ones that are concerned about whether
6 you're going to close it or not. And the last time we came
7 out with it as an alternative, boy, it hit the papers and it
8 went everywhere. And we have fought for three years or four
9 years now to get it back that Going-to-the-Sun highway is
10 not closed today. So, you know, if we jump out there and
11 say Okay, this is one of the alternatives that we want to
12 throw out there, we're going to create the same thing all
13 over again.

14 MS. TRIBE: So, Roscoe, what we just voted on
15 was not the majority, if we go with two-thirds. But I look
16 at Linda and look at Tony and I look at Tom. They're not at
17 the table who are feeling like we all believe the same
18 things and we're not getting something we need. They're a
19 diverse group of people who didn't stand up. So that tells
20 me that I might be more comfortable with the two-thirds,
21 which we've got.

22 This does not mean that there's going to be an
23 Alternative number 6 that closes the road. And that takes
24 care of your issue, I think. What it does mean is that when
25 the people do the environmental analysis, you know,

1 environment includes human environment. They have to write
2 the socioeconomic part in here as well as what happens to
3 grizzly bears and what happens to soils and all those kinds
4 of things. So I think by including it as part of 5, what
5 you really do is give yourselves permission to see how it
6 might not work. Because in the analysis, they have to show
7 all the bad parts of it as well as maybe we could get it
8 done faster. So, you know, having things included in
9 alternatives don't necessarily -- it doesn't mean that
10 that's the decision. It just means you've got this full set
11 of drawers, now you're going to look in every one of them,
12 you're going to compare some, you're going to do some
13 alternative evaluation in the document, and they'll come up
14 with the preferred. And my bet is the preferred might be a
15 hybrid of the five that are out there.

16 MR. BAKER: Do we get to come up with a
17 preferred?

18 MS. TRIBE: No.

19 MR. BAKER: So we don't get to rank.

20 MS. TRIBE: You could rank them at dinner.
21 That might be a nice dinner exercise.

22 MR. BAKER: Because I'm in the Charter we
23 have to give our recommendations to the Park. In how we
24 give those recommendations to the Park, can we not say in
25 there, though, Our preferred option is this, the other

1 options are also this?

2 MS. TRIBE: Here's what the Charter says.

3 "The purpose of the Committee is to advise the National Park
4 Service in the development of alternatives for
5 rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road in Glacier
6 National Park, focusing on road condition and rehabilitation
7 strategies, including scheduling, costs and measures to
8 mitigate impacts on visitors and local economies. These
9 alternatives will then be analyzed in an environmental
10 document that will provide the basis for the agency
11 decision."

12 MR. BAKER: But that's not saying that we
13 could not say, as an Advisory Committee, that we have gone
14 through all the alternatives, we like this one, this one and
15 this one; as a Committee we feel that you may want to look a
16 little closer at this one, because that's the one that we
17 think makes the most sense, as an Advisory Committee.

18 MS. LEWIS: If we were to take that
19 recommendation, we couldn't do a lot with it. The NEPA
20 process does not allow us to declare a preference to any
21 alternative, when we begin that process.

22 MR. BAKER: It does not let you do that?

23 MS. LEWIS: Doesn't let anybody do
24 it -- anyone do that in a legal sense of how you put the
25 document, meeting its legal obligations with the public. I

1 mean, you can make the statement, it's a great statement to
2 make. But it would carry no weight in the environmental
3 process.

4 MR. BAKER: Then I'm getting back to what
5 Roscoe is saying. If the Advisory says We have these
6 alternatives. We've looked at them all as an Advisory
7 Committee. We think that this one looks to be about the
8 best one, in our estimation, at this point in time, it goes
9 out there and the Advisory Committee this is what they think
10 should happen, where it goes from there we can't control.

11 MS. TRIBE: So, Brian, I'm going to -- just
12 as the process person, we designed the process so that we
13 would agree on a set of acceptable alternatives. If we were
14 going to take 16 people and now try to rank those, it's an
15 entirely different process and a different design and a
16 different set of efforts and about a half-day process. And
17 so you can do the dot game, which I really dislike, because
18 all it does is give you sort of majorities and minorities.
19 To get to a consensus on that, probably, is more than
20 anybody at the table really bargained for. And so I was
21 teasing you about you can do it at dinner if you want. But
22 I'm not prepared, in terms of agenda or time, to try to
23 bring us to consensus on one preferred. I think it's a big
24 thing -- there are two other points I'd like to make on it.

25 One is, you're going to come back together the

1 15th of November, and you're going to look at these
2 alternatives one more time after they're sort of revamped.
3 Is that right? Do they get revamped between now and
4 November?

5 MR. BABB: They'll be circulated and looked
6 at, but the Committee can be --

7 MS. TRIBE: No; do the engineers revamp them?
8 But we get public comments on them. And so, Brian, when you
9 come back in November, you may have some different feeling
10 about them, based on the public comment.

11 The other thing is that you only have part of the
12 information. Once they go through that review in the
13 environmental analysis, you won't have a consensus -- you
14 won't have an opportunity to have a consensus
15 recommendation, but you certainly would be able to give your
16 input on what you felt was the preferred at that point.

17 MR. BAKER: My fear is that people are going
18 to perceive that we are in agreement with Alternative 5,
19 even though it's only one of three; that we are going to be
20 in agreement with Alternative 5 to close to road.

21 MS. PAHL: Why?

22 MR. BAKER: Because it's like Roscoe says.
23 That if you put the word out there and it's even being
24 discussed as an option, it's all they see. I know that may
25 not be the way that the environmental document comes out,

1 but when it comes out that the Committee has given the
2 following alternatives and they scan the alternatives and
3 that one option 5 pops out, guess which one's going to get
4 all the press?

5 MS. TRIBE: So could I have the newspaper
6 person come up here, please? Because we need to --

7 MR. MANN: I can tell you right now that the
8 media -- I mean, if you're going to close the road, if
9 you're going to close it, if it's closed, we will use the C
10 word.

11 MS. TRIBE: Absolutely.

12 MR. MANN: And we're not going to use some
13 euphemism.

14 MS. TRIBE: But the worst thing you could
15 hear here is that the group is going to close to road.
16 There hasn't been any discussion about closing the road.

17 MR. MANN: I understand that. It's just that
18 if that's what is decided by the Park Service, then that's
19 how we'll report it.

20 MS. TRIBE: Absolutely.

21 What I want to do is honor Brian's comment. And
22 why don't you let us have a chance to write the
23 recommendation tonight, give you the printed sheet back and
24 make sure that you're satisfied with the words tomorrow,
25 that we're not putting big red flags that, for example,

1 Roscoe are afraid might just put people over the roof. And
2 I would ask you to wait until -- I mean, you can do anything
3 you want. But I'm hoping that you get the written version
4 of the recommendation.

5 MR. O'QUINN: In support of what you're
6 thinking, I think it would be premature to come up with a
7 recommendation now, or in November, because the process is
8 not complete. Because I think it would be counterproductive
9 to the Park Service if we, as a body, said 1, 2, 3 or 16.
10 Then if they try to do anything else, then the papers will
11 have a field day with it. Because -- and we would be acting
12 with partial information. We haven't seen the matrix. We
13 haven't seen all the socioeconomic data. We haven't seen
14 this natural environment. We haven't seen all the cultural
15 environment. And all of this has to be fitted into the
16 matrix to make these alternatives.

17 MS. TRIBE: I believe decision makers should
18 keep the space open as long as possible. And if an advisory
19 group makes a recommendation on a preferred early in the
20 process, then she looks like the decision is predisposed
21 because it was part of her -- she was part of the group.
22 And I'd bet every one of you lunch today that she's not
23 going to close the road. So that would sort of give a false
24 impression about what might happen, in terms of
25 predisposition. So I want to take care of her. I want to

1 keep her decision space as open as possible, without us
2 coloring that.

3 Dave.

4 MR. JACKSON: Well, this other alternative,
5 which is really expedited production, is, in fact, very
6 probably impractical. Because you don't have to be a rocket
7 scientist to know that if she were asked to calculate the
8 impacts on tourism, it would far exceed any of the others,
9 and trade-offs would be very apparent. So the only issue
10 that I raised, really, about this, was as a practical
11 alternative, and yet we've kind of put it in there because
12 we're seeing some of this focus group kind of stuff that
13 keeps coming up and saying get It over with quick, which is
14 really expedited production and reconstruction or whatever.
15 And that's really the alternative that we're doing. It
16 isn't the C word, which is really -- it isn't coming out of
17 businesses, the C word sentences coming out, it's Get it
18 over with.

19 MS. PAHL: Expedite the process.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we should look at
21 these recommendations that are typed up at the end of the
22 day, and there seems to be a real reticence to have a
23 recommendation of a preference by this Committee. But first
24 of all, it's been abundantly clear, from day one, advisory,
25 no decision-making power whatsoever. And I tend to think

1 that if there were a preference expressed that was not the C
2 word and was not 1, that it might help the Park Service out
3 in deflecting any comments like Was that Committee seriously
4 thinking about recommending closure here? Because if this
5 Committee is not, which I don't think they are, then I think
6 it might be helpful in the public information process.

7 So I think we ought to give some thought to, if we
8 could reach it, not spending a lot of time, and if we could
9 quickly reach consensus on what the Committee prefers, I
10 think it might be of value to the Park Service. And
11 everybody knows it's not tying their hands. We have no
12 authority, we have no decision-making authority. It's
13 entirely their decision.

14 MS. TRIBE: So are you willing to wait until
15 you see the public comment before you make that decision?
16 Are you willing to wait until your November meeting before
17 you decide if you want to register some preference?

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: My thought would be to do it
19 tomorrow morning, because we're going to have these
20 preliminary recommendations out in front of the public
21 tomorrow. And I just think it would be more helpful to the
22 Park Service, and to the process, to have it out there.
23 That's my personal thought. I would be happy to be
24 convinced otherwise, but it seems to me it might be better
25 for the process and the Park Service.

1 MS. TRIBE: Do you want to ask Suzann?

2 MS. LEWIS: Again, when I look at the
3 Committee's Charter, this Committee, within its Charter, has
4 a broad ability to make a range of recommendations. So we
5 don't want to preclude you in how you -- or I don't think
6 the Committee ought to be precluded in how it makes its
7 recommendations. But in doing so, you need to know how they
8 may be used or not used or what the impact of them are. And
9 that would be, I think, one of the criteria I would use to
10 make the decision, along with every other member here,
11 whether or not it's important to rank or rate the preference
12 of the Committee. I, like you, would doubt that we could
13 reach consensus on it in a short amount of time.

14 MS. TRIBE: Depends on the drugs we use, but
15 we could probably do it. But at -- if we can't do it, the
16 next best thing we could do is have a relative ranking of
17 alternatives.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I'd say if we couldn't reach
19 consensus we could just drop it; that would be fine. But if
20 we could reach consensus, I don't think it should be not
21 intended to put pressure on the Park Service but, rather,
22 deflect Brian's concern that the public might perceive the
23 closure alternative as a serious recommendation from the
24 Committee. I wouldn't want to have that out there.

25 MR. BAKER: Either that or we don't even put

1 option 5 in and let that get flushed out through the NEPA
2 process.

3 MS. TOWNSEND: I wanted to go back and revise
4 it, some things that Roscoe said. And you're putting a lot
5 of weight on the business survey, and so let's make sure
6 we're interpreting what these people said as well as we can.

7 48 percent of the people made a remark about
8 sending out a positive media message. You know, most of the
9 people said Send out a message. Don't use the word
10 "closure." Advertise the Park as open and accessible. Send
11 positive messages. So most of the people made those kinds
12 of remarks.

13 At the same time, a good chunk of people made
14 remarks about Do it now, do it fast. Now, if they thought
15 Do it fast meant five years -- none of us know what they had
16 in their head when they said Do it fast. Some people used
17 the C word; they did. But what I'm trying to say is more
18 people said use The media, Use a positive message the Park
19 is open, the Park is accessible. So don't read more into
20 the business survey than is really there. Just be careful.
21 I think Roscoe's remarks were right on target in that
22 regard.

23 MS. ANDERSON: I just have a question on when
24 is the public comment scheduled?

25 MS. TRIBE: There isn't one today.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Tomorrow morning.

2 MS. ANDERSON: When the recommendations are
3 released, is there going to be?

4 MS. LEWIS: It will start in a couple days.
5 If we finish at noon tomorrow, we have to have draft
6 recommendations that we'll be putting out for public
7 comment, and it runs through October 20-something. Then
8 that comes back out to the Committee to review and make
9 comment back to the consultant, whether or not you want
10 to -- or back to whether you want to change the
11 recommendations or not, and then you have your final
12 meeting.

13 MR. BABB: There's a schedule in your folder.

14 MS. ANDERSON: I guess where I'm coming from
15 is that I know a lot of the businesses around the Park are
16 starting to close up. And I think it would be really good
17 if they had that opportunity.

18 MR. JEWETT: Just to follow up on Linda's
19 question. The public comment period, what are they
20 commenting on? Are you taking all the information the week
21 before from us and, hopefully, do we know alternatives for
22 the public comment, or are you putting out the same ones
23 that we looked at?

24 MS. LEWIS: We're going to be putting out
25 your recommendations to us, which is the purpose of this

1 meeting.

2 MR. JEWETT: And you're going to turn those
3 around in 48 hours -- 72 hours?

4 MS. LEWIS: As they exist.

5 MS. TRIBE: We're going to turn them around
6 for you to be able to see them tomorrow morning.

7 MS. PAHL: Can I suggest that we wait to see
8 those recommendations before we decide the question of
9 making a recommendation or not? Because I think they would
10 be a lot easier to respond to that with the thing in front
11 of us. Because right now, there's probably some confusion
12 about what we did say and what we didn't say. And I think
13 it would be really helpful to see it in writing.

14 MS. TRIBE: Especially with Alternative 5.
15 Because I don't think, in any way, did we call Alternative 5
16 the closure alternative. It was an alternative that looked
17 at closing things in different pieces, different segments,
18 different times, for different reasons. But that within
19 that there would be an analysis of this fast-track kind of
20 closure and what it would mean. And so I don't think that
21 when you see them, this is not going to come across as the
22 kind of alternative where you would want to see the road
23 closed for long periods of time.

24 Could we agree, then, that we'll make the decision
25 in the morning about whether we will try to find a preferred

1 among us? Is that all right?

2 MR. BAKER: Or even to include number 5.

3 MS. TRIBE: Well, I want to have that
4 decision before tomorrow when we leave here.

5 MR. O'QUINN: I thought we'd already decided.

6 MS. TRIBE: I think maybe we're not clear on
7 what you mean by new information.

8 MR. BAKER: Maybe I'm just talking for a few.
9 But at the beginning, I thought that we, as an Advisory
10 Committee, would be able to articulate our preferred
11 alternative. And while it doesn't specifically say that in
12 the Charter, I personally was led to believe, last year,
13 that we would be able to give a sense, our own feeling, of
14 the preferred alternative for the Going-to-the-Sun Road.
15 And it was even articulated last fall that we don't want to
16 go anywhere near closure.

17 Now, all of a sudden, just because it comes up
18 here as an Alternative 5 in the Engineering Report on road
19 segment closures, we're talking about this, and now we're
20 going to be including it as an alternative, which is going
21 to be going as an alternative to the Park Service, we're
22 talking about closing it again. And only this time we do
23 not get to say or articulate that that is not really what we
24 want, but we have to include it anyways because it's going
25 to come out in the NEPA process. We don't get to say that.

1 MS. TRIBE: So I'm going to ask other members
2 of the Committee if they would just kind of say some things
3 back, because I think you're seeing it in different ways.
4 And once the draft environmental impact statement comes
5 back, my bet is that you're going to get a whole bunch of
6 comments that say How come you didn't analyze the
7 alternative that had to do with closing parts of the road at
8 certain times?

9 MR. BAKER: Possibly.

10 MS. PAHL: I don't think so. We shouldn't
11 look at this, or have anybody look at this, as closing the
12 road, because it isn't, number one.

13 Number two, it would be dishonest not to include
14 it, because to do the rock scaling, they have to close the
15 segments of the road at periods of time, maybe up to four
16 hours; they're going to have to, or all the season, all the
17 things your group looked at in terms of opening. So I think
18 that this alternative has to be there. And, again, I think
19 we ought to read it before we become alarmed about what it
20 says and what people will think we mean. I really do.

21 MR. BAKER: Okay.

22 MS. MOE: What she said.

23 MR. JEWETT: Barbara spoken it elegantly.
24 The only thing I would add is that I think it would be
25 valuable to define "closure." I think we should define

1 "closure," because I think everybody has a different
2 definition of what closure means here.

3 MR. BLACK: Well, we're talking about road
4 segment closure. And in number 3 and number 4, we're
5 talking about closure. And so we're kind of getting caught
6 on a couple of things here. And if we could really and
7 truly define, as Tony said, what segment closure
8 means -- and is it only a small portion of the road that's
9 going to be closed while we're doing these things. And, of
10 course, when we're doing the rock scaling, we're going to be
11 doing that in the spring or fall when we can have access to
12 the road without any traffic on it whatsoever. I think, I
13 guess, from my perspective is, how are we going to put 3 and
14 4 together? And should there -- or is there going to be an
15 opportunity to look at what that combination is going to
16 entail tomorrow morning?

17 MS. TRIBE: Yes. And when we sort of write
18 this stuff up together, then you will have something to
19 react to. But the main comments I wanted, Brian, you to
20 hear, is that I think most of the other people at the table
21 are not looking at number 5 as a closure alternative.
22 They're looking at it in terms of how do you use segment
23 closures to facilitate getting the job done. And they may
24 be a little more extreme in 3 and 4, but that Joe referred
25 to a page early in the discussion that said We looked at

1 fast-tracking, we couldn't do it under five years, it costs
2 64- to 78-, something like that, million, and that we
3 dismissed it because it wasn't practical. And I think that
4 kind of discussion comes into 5.

5 MR. BAKER: Let's see how it's written in the
6 morning.

7 MS. TRIBE: Great.

8 MR. O'QUINN: There was a Committee and our
9 Charter what we can do. Are we precluded -- getting back to
10 what Randy said, are we precluded from coming back, not
11 necessarily as a group to meet, but as a group
12 recommendation after the draft EIS and the comments have
13 been circulated on that to make a recommendation, as a
14 Committee, to the Park Service?

15 MS. TRIBE: Do you know what I'd really like
16 to do is save that topic for tomorrow. Because we've got
17 mitigation to do yet, today, and that's one of the things
18 that we thought would come up tomorrow morning.

19 MR. O'QUINN: I just think that has to do
20 with a range.

21 MS. TRIBE: It goes to what is the role after
22 November.

23 MR. SENN: I have one thing to say. And I
24 guess, Barney, his description of the alternatives was kind
25 of saying it was based on funding and funding allocations. I

1 think, in walking the job with Dick, and I think Dick was
2 the first one, the evolution of the alternatives is based on
3 all this input; how you're going to engineer the job. But
4 the common theme thread is traffic control. So basically,
5 these alternatives are based on varying degrees of traffic
6 control. And those kinds of things can be manipulated, and
7 you're right, in different combinations throughout the whole
8 job. So I want to make sure that everybody understands that
9 that was kind of the basis that drove the creations and
10 different types of alternatives, not necessarily funding
11 levels. Because we realize -- I mean, that was a ceiling,
12 you could only do so much in one year. But that was how,
13 basically, the backbone of each of the five were created.

14 MS. TRIBE: Thank you, Nick.

15 Well, again thank you very much for your hard and
16 tedious work this afternoon.

17 I want to honor every single comment at the table.
18 And it's hard. If you have one more thing to say, then I
19 would invite you to say it, because we're a lot better off
20 doing it now than later when we're talking about it out in
21 the hall and we didn't get it to the table. So I appreciate
22 your work. I appreciate the newspaper being here and
23 letting us sort of tease him a little bit. I'd like you to
24 take about 10 minutes. I'd like you to take at least 15
25 minutes, and Bambi's going up and take a nap for 15 minutes.

1 And while you're out, would you not talk about the
2 discussion we just had? Talk about the weather. Talk about
3 something else. Talk about what you're hoping we have for
4 dinner or those cookies back there.

5 (Proceedings in recess from 4:45 p.m. to
6 5:00 p.m.)

7 Ms. Tribe obtains permission from the Committee
8 members to take the five reports on the agreements reached
9 on the alternatives and, without changing words or intent,
10 turn them into consistent sentences. The Committee will be
11 able to look at them tomorrow to see that they're correct.
12 The discussion tomorrow should be more useful if the members
13 can see a more polished product. Mr. Baker requests that
14 the flip charts be kept, not discarded. Ms. Tribe also is
15 granted permission to use the same format as used in the set
16 of recommendations that came out of the first couple of
17 meetings and that Chairman Ogle signed; basically in memo
18 form.

19 MS. TRIBE: Using the following criteria, I'd
20 like you to be in three groups. I'd like the groups to be
21 of approximately the same size, and I'd like there to be
22 diversity in the groups. Would you take one minute and form
23 yourselves into the groups, please?

24 Take the list of mitigation measures out of your
25 packet -- this is table 6, Visitor Development Strategy.

1 Before you go to your groups, here are your tasks. I'm
2 going to give you about 40 minutes to do it. First task, in
3 your group I want you to suggest and document on flip chart
4 the three to five most critical socioeconomic challenges or
5 issues that need to be mitigated. So I want you to have
6 some context to looking at these mitigation measures, and
7 that goes with regardless of your assignment.

8 B, I want you to review all the listed mitigation
9 measures that are on this table 6 and did we miss anything.
10 As Jean said, Are there any things we would add?

11 MR. JACKSON: Well, the usual thought of
12 mitigation are the kinds of things that Jean has for the
13 changes in employment and tour system receipts across the
14 engineering alternatives, and also the way we might revise
15 those as these new alternatives are put out. And those are
16 the usual ways of mitigating. These are wonderful. But I
17 think if we leave the others out, we're not doing our job.

18 MS. TRIBE: And a remark was made similar to
19 me at the break by Jayne. But because these are the ones
20 that the Committee and Jean sort of looked at as in some
21 ways these are marketing kinds of things, they really are
22 visitor development actions rather than these mitigation
23 things we've talked about in the alternative. So let's -- I
24 made the mistake of calling them mitigation measures again.
25 So let's call them what they are; visitor development

1 strategies. How do we make sure we don't lose the visitors?
2 How do we make sure we get more? How do we continue to have
3 them come to the Park?

4 So B, review the -- scratch out mitigation
5 measures and write "visitor development strategies." And
6 then list any that Jean or the Committee missed.

7 And then C, I'm going to give you an assignment,
8 and I'd like each group to mark these on your sheet as you
9 go. Because Jean was very helpful in saying some of these
10 should not be lumped together. So she sort of helped me
11 with the assignments. And this is for C on your task sheet.

12 So this group is the raspberry group. And you
13 have actions 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13.

14 And for this group, you're the green group. You
15 have actions 2, 5, 8, 11, and 14.

16 And then this group is the brown group, brown
17 nosers or whatever else. And you have what's left; 3, 6, 9,
18 12, and 15.

19 And for the ones that were assigned to you, I'd
20 like you to look at task C, draft recommendations related to
21 those visitor development strategies that include the
22 following: I want you to give an expanded description of
23 your action, if necessary, if it's not clear, if we need to
24 have better understanding, if you can flush it out a little
25 bit more, et cetera.

1 Second, I want you to identify, of the five
2 assigned to you, which of those really belong to the Park
3 Service where we want them to be the head shepard, that we
4 would have expectations about them doing some of these
5 things. And you may and you may or may not have some.

6 Third, on page 156 in the socioeconomic document,
7 large document, there's a list of what we're talking about
8 here and some suggestions about who really should be the
9 implementors or facilitators. So I just want you to confirm
10 that or change it.

11 And then I want you to give us a timeline for
12 those five things. When should they get started? If you
13 want to benchmark them in six months, you want to have this
14 done in a year. But I think that we're not talking further
15 out than maybe 12 to 24 months, because we don't know what
16 will happen. So let's try to concentrate on 12 months,
17 unless you think you should say some things of time beyond
18 that.

19 So really, what we're trying to do is some
20 affirmation of what Jean and the Committee did, and then
21 we're doing just sort of a rough cut at an action plan for
22 these so that when we leave, they really are going to carry
23 forward.

24 MS. MOE: Some of these actions are not
25 commented in the General Management Plan. Are we to assume

1 that we like them so much that the General Management Plan
2 might change them?

3 MS. TRIBE: Or because of the General
4 Management Plan, we don't think they're worth the energy.

5 It's 5:15. I'd like to see where you are in a
6 half hour.

7 (Whereupon, at 5:15 p.m. the small groups commence
8 their discussions, and at 6:00 p.m. their conclusions are
9 presented.)

10 MS. TRIBE: Could we start with the brown
11 group? The brown group.

12 MS. STEWART: We had 3, 6, 9, 12, 16. Our
13 group was Don, Suzann, Randy, David, and Joni.

14 MR. JACKSON: I wasn't there very much.

15 MS. STEWART: On A1, the three -- we only
16 identified three, actually, but the three that we thought
17 were most critical were wrong or negative marketing
18 messaging or communications regarding the Park and the road.
19 Our second one on A is inadequate visitor/public
20 transportation systems. And our third one, lack of
21 real-time and variety of information on the road events,
22 activities, in the Park and/or surrounding communities.
23 Sorry; we have A4. Reduced or flat visitation during and
24 after construction. Those were our four most critical.

25 On B, which is review the listed mitigation

1 measures, we have on number 5, we thought that you should
2 add a Centennial celebration. That was the events when it
3 had Lewis and Clarke, because in 2010 it's the hundred year
4 Centennial event for Glacier Park. So we thought that
5 should be added. And that was not my idea, but... and we
6 all loved it and thought it was a great idea.

7 On C, we split this up like this is C number 3.
8 And this one was on the amphitheaters. And we numbered
9 ours. The four bullets are 1, 2, 3, 4, just so
10 we can go a little quicker.

11 Number 1, we thought no expanded description is
12 necessary. Number 2, we thought these should be built
13 outside the Park because of the hassle of building these
14 kinds of things in the Park. It would be a lot quicker if
15 they could be built and maintained outside the Park. We
16 thought that private, nonprofit or tribal should build
17 these, and we have no timeline on that one. Whenever
18 someone decides to do it.

19 C6 was on improving the hyperlinks and the
20 websites. We decided that the Park has a great website.
21 And we were also informed by our wonderful Park
22 representative that you can't put linkages on the Park
23 pages. A private individual can link to the Park page, but
24 the Park page cannot have linkages there. So that was kind
25 of a moot point.

1 MS. LEWIS: Regarding businesses and
2 commercial sites.

3 MS. STEWART: So there was no expanded
4 description necessary.

5 And number 2 was none, but there should be heavy
6 participation from the Park. Number 3, it should be done by
7 private, nonprofit, tribal, and this should say tourism. We
8 got in a hurry. 4, we decided that that could be done in 18
9 months; that, you know, that would be up to probably whoever
10 decides to do it to get it done.

11 Number 9, public information program. Yes, we
12 need to expand it. 2, it should be expanded by the National
13 Park Service. On 3, other facilitators would be nonprofit,
14 tribal and private. And 4, we have no near term timeline.

15 Should the visitor centers be broadened at the
16 east and west entrance? We said Yes. And 2, this is a
17 national park. 3, it was national park. Number 4, once
18 again, no near term timeline. Because there is no design or
19 plan to back these up yet.

20 5 was improve the cooperation between the economic
21 development organizations. Yes, we need to do this. Number
22 2, we decided that Glacier Country should be the lead
23 organization on this because we are all a part of Glacier
24 Country anyway, so they should be the lead. And that number
25 3, all of the other economic development organizations

1 should take part in this. And number 4, it should be done
2 in 18 months. And that's all; we're done. And we get the
3 prize for speed.

4 MS. TRIBE: Nice job.

5 (Applause.)

6 MS. TRIBE: One of the things that kind of
7 shouts out loud and clear here is that when you get some
8 sense of design and when the project's actually going to
9 start, whoever's going to do these, probably could turn this
10 into a strategic plan that really does have goals and those
11 kinds of things with them.

12 Well, nice work.

13 So could we go to the green group next.

14 MS. ANDERSON: The green group was made up of
15 Barney, Barbara, Jayne, Roscoe, and myself, and Tony.

16 MR. JEWETT: That's fine, Linda.

17 MS. ANDERSON: And I'll step forward with
18 Glacier Country will help with all this.

19 On number A, our priorities were don't lose
20 dollars for the local businesses. Get rid of the negative
21 visitor perception of Glacier Park being closed. Maintain
22 and enhance visitor experience. Right now the Park is not
23 really visitor friendly with signs. We talked about trails
24 that need to be rated, just like the ski trails are, and
25 also, if we bring in more international travel, we don't

1 have a lot of international signage anywhere in the area.

2 What effect using these dollars might mean to the
3 rest of Montana. The Inland west, which is like Spokane,
4 Coeur d'Alene, because these are big markets for us as well
5 as Canada -- and please underline Canada. We wanted to be
6 sure that Jayne got Canada.

7 Under B, our numbers were number 2, Glacier
8 National Park needs to improve relationships with the
9 Montana Department of Transportation. And also, kind of
10 along the same line, the same thing with the Blackfeet. And
11 that ties into the Highway 49 being the scenic highway. Not
12 saying that you don't work with them, but if there was a way
13 to make that work better. Explore an initiative to create a
14 loop recreational experience, cultural and historical and
15 natural value experience. So that's what we're trying to do
16 with Highways 89 and 49, tie that all in.

17 MS. PAHL: Does anybody in the room know
18 whether the state has a scenic byway program? They should
19 have one. They missed the boat.

20 MS. TRIBE: So it's just the federal one.

21 MS. ANDERSON: And then we went ahead and
22 assigned who would be responsible for that, and that would
23 be BNESA, the group that was in yesterday in the public
24 information time. That that could be a source for
25 discussion. And we assigned this to Joni.

1 MS. STEWART: You're just paying me back.

2 MR. O'QUINN: Didn't take long, did it?

3 MS. ANDERSON: So our next one is number 5.

4 That's about Lewis and Clark. The celebration and
5 commemoration is between 2003 and 2006. The time they were
6 actually in Montana was in '05, and so basically jump on the
7 band wagon. The Lewis and Clark Commission is already set
8 up here in Montana, and we also assigned that to Glacier
9 Country and to Travel Montana to be part of that.

10 And a question that we have, which would be we
11 assigned to this Glacier National Park, is will the road be
12 under rehabilitation? Sorry, I used the C word there,
13 during the bicentennial, especially during '05 and '06?
14 That's a question that we had. Also under number 5, Glacier
15 National Park Centennial in 2010, build up to that with all
16 kinds of activities.

17 The next one we had was number 8. Please note
18 bear cookies. Website visitor center. Just basically
19 communicating with the visitor about what's going on with
20 the construction. And we assigned that to Glacier Park.
21 And also, we put concessionaire. Somebody would need to
22 make those cookies.

23 Number 11, heritage tours. Set up heritage tours
24 with the Blackfeet in Glacier National Park. Increase
25 current programs that are with the Blackfeet, and use the

1 Waterton Heritage Program as an example of what's been done
2 with private and public. Is that a good way to say that?
3 And we assigned that, again, to Glacier Park, Glacier
4 Country and the Blackfeet.

5 Number 14 was about training. And that's already
6 an excellent program in place in Montana called Super Host.
7 And encourage Travel Montana to continue to fund that as
8 well as Glacier Country and other regions. And encourage
9 Park concessionaires to use Super Host training as part of
10 their contract. And we assigned that to Jan Laws.

11 MS. LEWIS: Somebody may not be aware but we
12 have the Ambassador Program that we do in the National Park
13 Service. And that's what our concessionaires do. And just
14 make sure they're aware.

15 MS. PAHL: Whatever they're using, it isn't
16 working, so we need to use something else.

17 MS. TRIBE: Would you be a little more,
18 Barbara?

19 MR. JEWETT: She's turning on the Park
20 Service. Barney, stand up.

21 MS. ANDERSON: And you probably already
22 noticed that we didn't give timelines to these, because we
23 are overachievers. And we were still working on our big
24 plan of how to solve all the mitigation. ASAP on all those.

25 MS. PAHL: Drum roll.

1 MS. ANDERSON: We have a theme called See
2 America First. Play up on the patriotism of what's just
3 happened. Get everyone to the national parks, especially
4 Glacier Park. Maybe we partner with AMTRAK to follow up
5 what used to be done with Burlington Northern -- I'm sorry,
6 Great Northern. And find a national spokesperson. And the
7 first one that jumped out was Stephen Ambrose, because he
8 lives in Helena. He's already involved with Lewis and
9 Clark, and they wrote a book about the railroad. So that
10 just seemed to fit right in there.

11 So our big idea is the same campaign be undertaken
12 to increase new visitation from country opportunities that
13 are congruent with interpretive and recreational goals of
14 Glacier National Park. Absorb/mitigate the rehabilitation
15 of the road while furthering the Glacier Park General
16 Management Plan.

17 MS. TRIBE: So what you have done is give us
18 sort of a goal for the overall business here for
19 these -- the one you were looking at.

20 MR. JEWETT: We were talking about in more
21 concrete terms. We were talking about this. If we look at
22 all the mitigation ideas that are popping up, not just in
23 our group but in all the groups in isolation, we're going to
24 have to go after this in a piecemeal way. The Park's
25 General Management Plan has set forth some very good

1 directions in regards to long-term interpretation, long-term
2 recreational cooperative with the adjacent land management
3 and other partners in order to protect the values that are
4 here, but enhance them for the public. And if you were to
5 wrap all these mitigation measures around those GMP
6 recreational goals, which are very related to mitigating the
7 possible loss of the Sun Road, and make it a recommendation
8 from this Committee to the Park Service, this should be a
9 part of the recommendations that go to Congress, for there
10 may be possibilities to move a lot of these things forward.
11 And without going against the grain of anything and, in
12 effect, furthering the protection of this area and the
13 opportunities. And wrapping it around the theme of, you
14 know, See America First. So that's -- it's more than a
15 goal, it could be a concrete strategy.

16 MS. TRIBE: Absolutely.

17 MS. PAHL: And remember, See America First
18 was the great railway slogan to bring people. So all we're
19 doing is bringing it back, renewing that campaign.

20 MR. JEWETT: And trying to build
21 infrastructure. And doing it in a way to advance the goals
22 of the Park.

23 MS. STEWART: This is an aside, but you know
24 the Lewis and Clark state committee is trying to do step-on
25 guides with tours with Amtrak. So that would be a good lead

1 organization to lead into that type of program. They've got
2 some grant money that they're working with and developing.
3 They're not real developed, but might keep that in mind as
4 part of that program.

5 MS. ANDERSON: Well, I think we looked even
6 broader than that, recognizing that you don't have a
7 marketing arm in the Park. And so we need to find a
8 marketing arm to do this, whether it's an outside firm,
9 whether it's people that are already involved in this. But
10 something would need to help market all this.

11 MS. PAHL: Presented as a mitigation measure
12 rather than just Oh, dear, what are we going to do, the
13 road's closed. Go positive. The best defense is an
14 offense. So make that a piece Congress gives the Park. And
15 even if they use it to mark consultants, to mark tourism,
16 that helps to get the message out. But that's a way to
17 mitigate and bring in more people than maybe currently are
18 coming and perhaps see the Park in the timeline.

19 MS. ANDERSON: And our timeline on that is
20 2002.

21 MS. TRIBE: So this would be a strategy, even
22 if you weren't working on the road. You think of
23 flat-lining visitors and all of that stuff.

24 MR. JEWETT: The road gives you an
25 opportunity to advance the Park priorities that they've

1 already established with the GMP as a mitigation strategy.

2 MS. TRIBE: What do you think? Nice job.

3 Very nice job.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. TRIBE: This is the last group, the
6 raspberry group with -- you, Lowell, wanted to be called
7 thimble berries.

8 MR. MEZNARCH: This is myself, Brian, Susie,
9 Anna Marie, and Tom.

10 Regarding the three to five issues and challenges;
11 number 1 reduced visitation resulting in lost dollars, lost
12 employment, lost opportunity for the National Park Service
13 to educate visitors. And we really wanted to stress that
14 lost opportunity.

15 Number 2, image problems. That perhaps the image
16 that stewardship was tarnished; the Park not fulfilling its
17 mandate; a short-term road under construction and long-term
18 road not under construction, recognizing that just because
19 the rehabilitation is complete doesn't mean that business
20 will bounce back immediately to where it was. That that
21 needs to be addressed.

22 Number 3, build on the opportunities that renewed
23 commitment to Going-to-the-Sun Road presents. For example,
24 contractors will be used on the project. Let's try to get
25 as much of that benefit from new employment and contractor's

1 materials to stay local. So, for example, stone masons and
2 other skilled trades could be trained in the local schools
3 in the interim, before the rehabilitation starts, so both
4 during and after the rehabilitation. Because there will be
5 employment opportunities after rehabilitation to maintain
6 what's been done with the features. Develop and encourage
7 local supplies. So again, the benefits from the
8 construction. The majority of that, hopefully, will stay
9 local.

10 And then number 4, articulate through marketing
11 and product development that there's more to Glacier than
12 the Going-to-the-Sun Road. Loop routes, visitor centers,
13 other areas, hospitality training, et cetera.

14 We did not identify any new items that needed to
15 be added, as far as mitigation was concerned.

16 The items we specifically looked at: Number 1,
17 upgrade public transportation to and through the Park. We
18 enhanced that to include encourage/reduce red tape. We want
19 to ease existing regulations regarding the connections with
20 operators outside the Park who wish to provide supplementary
21 services. Because of the contract that exists with the
22 concessionaire being a closed contract, those things are not
23 possible now. That perhaps that could be worked out in a
24 renegotiation or in the process of a new contract, which we
25 thought was about three years away. The public

1 transportation plan still needs lots of work. In
2 conversation, we believe that the National Park Service
3 should facilitate that. It should start now and the ideas
4 continue to being developed.

5 Next was number 4, support upgrade of hotels and
6 winterize. We support the upgrade of the hotels and
7 recognize that the winterizing is outside the scope
8 available, and it's not supported by the General Management
9 Plan. The National Park Service should continue in
10 partnership with GPI in regard to the expansion and upgrades
11 to the facilities. Timeline for this is ongoing, immediate
12 and ongoing.

13 Number 7, change visitor prospect information to
14 introduce new sites. Visitor orientation away from the
15 Going-to-the-Sun Road, recognizing direction of the General
16 Management Plan. We're in agreement with that mitigation
17 strategy, that that's necessary. We believe the Park
18 Service must lead the way to show a commitment so that the
19 other agencies who are involved, Travel Montana, for
20 example, Glacier Country and others, that at the National
21 Park Service, Glacier National Park demonstrates a
22 commitment that they will follow through and provide their
23 resources and expertise.

24 We believe that Glacier should market proactively
25 and market not -- in the broad sense of the term, not direct

1 advertising, but to understand that there is a lot to market
2 and there are a lot of avenues in which marketing can be
3 done and that this should begin now and be an ongoing
4 process.

5 And number 10, the phrase was "manage the media
6 better." We believe that it's impossible to manage the
7 media. We changed that to utilize and inform the media more
8 effectively. Provide them with plenty of good information
9 and enlist and partner with them. Ask for their input.
10 Take tips from them, clues from them, prompts from them, and
11 then have the agencies that are involved in providing
12 information, whether they be federal agencies, tourism
13 promotion agencies, to have meetings together so that
14 they're all singing from the same sheet of music. And this,
15 again, would be start now and be an ongoing process.

16 Number 13, open more of Glacier and market new
17 venues. Our understanding of this is that that is not part
18 of the General Management Plan, nor has it been supported in
19 any significant way in scoping sessions or public input.
20 And we think we need to refocus attention toward
21 interpretation and education to additional areas. Not
22 perhaps opening or creating new trails, new picnic areas,
23 new campgrounds. Again, the Park Service should facilitate
24 this, and it should begin now and continue as an ongoing
25 process.

1 MS. TRIBE: Comments? Reactions? What do
2 you think? Are you okay with these to go forward?

3 (Applause.)

4 So in an overall sense, when you think about these
5 visitor development strategies, what do you observe? What
6 do you observe?

7 Suzann?

8 MS. LEWIS: I'm concerned about how we link.
9 I think this is all great information and really important
10 ideas, but I'm concerned how we link these into the process
11 by which we would find funding and support to do these
12 things. That's my -- I'm not seeing that right away; how we
13 would integrate this into a package that's sellable to
14 Congress.

15 Most of what we talked about here requires no EIS
16 process. It requires a commitment of time and dollars and
17 people, none of which we have, or on almost every one that
18 you attributed to the Park, and probably most that were
19 attributed to others to do. So that I think we need to give
20 some thought to overnight. I wouldn't want to lose this. I
21 don't want to lose this, but I know the way you lose these
22 things is people, time and money.

23 MR. JEWETT: And I agree. You're exactly
24 right. And that's exactly what was going through my mind,
25 Suzann. And I don't know what the possibilities are, other

1 than the fact that the opportunity is that we have focused
2 attention in a number of arenas, Congress included, that
3 there's going to be a problem with rehabilitation of the
4 road, and we've been charged to look at ways to mitigate
5 that focus, primarily on the road. Whereas, what we could
6 recommend to Congress is that the best strategy is a
7 proactive strategy that keeps people coming, just not around
8 the road. And we need money to beef up those opportunities.
9 And I don't know if that's possible, but I think we ought to
10 explore it.

11 MS. LEWIS: I do too.

12 MS. TRIBE: So one piece of homework for
13 tonight is to continue to think, outside the box, if you
14 will, about funding. I was remembering the foundation thing
15 that was talked about up here, I'm thinking about the
16 National Park Fund, or whatever that's called. We don't
17 know if those are possibilities. There may be -- who knows
18 what money's out there or how you might fund this kind of
19 thing. But, particularly, think about creative ways to
20 attach these ideas to the package that goes to Congress.

21 What other observations would you make?

22 MS. TOWNSEND: Just to build right on Tony's
23 remark, I think, actually, Suzann, there's going to be a
24 link when the EIS is done. And there is an alternative
25 invariably. The alternative will relate to a reduction in

1 visitors. That's the primary sort of translator into the
2 local economy. These are ideas to correct that downturn.

3 So I think when the EIS is complete, you'll be
4 able to make the argument that these are the mitigation
5 tools we would like to use in this local economy to help us
6 weather the economic downturn. So I think the link will be
7 there in a more quantitative way when the EIS is done, which
8 is really another way to underscore what Tony just said.

9 MS. TRIBE: So perhaps in the way the Forest
10 Service asks for money when they have a huge fire calamity
11 in an area and they go back in and they involve community,
12 the dollars come through state and private in a different
13 way, but maybe there's mechanisms we haven't even thought
14 about, knowing you're an entirely different agency and a
15 different department.

16 MR. JACKSON: The only observation, I think,
17 that's important to make is that one of the virtues of a
18 group like this is that we create a different kind of set of
19 views that might come out of an internal group that might be
20 more reflective of general public sentiment. And there's no
21 real environmental voice in this group at all. And I think
22 that there's going to be, outside this group, some fairly
23 strong antidevelopment thinking. And so I think we've got
24 to remember that that's not coming -- there's no one
25 speaking from that point of view at all here. And that's

1 kind of a little scary to me.

2 MS. PAHL: I think that's Tony. He
3 introduced himself again at this meeting as representing the
4 environmental group.

5 MS. LEWIS: National environmental group.

6 MS. TRIBE: I think all you're reminding us,
7 Dave, is that in the operating environment out there, there
8 may be interests that we haven't thought about yet.

9 MR. JEWETT: I'm assuming that everything we
10 recommend is recommended within the sideboards of what
11 governs the resources of this Park. And if it's not, then I
12 would raise my voice differently. That's why I was specific
13 about the fact that these ideas need to be within the
14 parameters of the General Management Plan, which was about
15 the Park.

16 MS. TRIBE: Which has been through an
17 environmental process.

18 MR. JEWETT: Which means nonimpairment is
19 what it means.

20 MS. KREMENIK: One other quick note, and it's
21 something I noticed as we were going through the three
22 groups, looking at the different alternatives, that it
23 wasn't mentioned that Glacier is part of the
24 Glacier/Waterton International Peace Park. And there should
25 be some opportunities there to promote those values,

1 especially given current times. That might be something to
2 focus on.

3 MS. TRIBE: So, Jayne, when we edit this,
4 would you help us to insert that language where it needs to
5 be?

6 MR. BAKER: Jayne just stole my thunder a
7 little bit on that. But just to enhance that, for a long
8 time in Montana, and the United States in general, the
9 aspects, I think, of the International Peace Park and the
10 World Heritage Site designation have gone not as -- it has
11 not been reinforced as much as maybe it should have been.
12 Whereas in Canada, that is a centerpiece.

13 And in particular, in what's been happening the
14 last few weeks in America, I think there has to be a renewed
15 effort in the marketing images and messages that go out that
16 reinforce that; the International Peace Park, the World
17 Heritage Site. Because you're really going to have to work
18 hard now, within Montana and Glacier, to get those
19 international visitors back. Give them a reason to come
20 back. Give them something special to come back to. So I
21 really think we're -- that's an initiative that Glacier Park
22 should -- they do it on their materials now. I think it
23 should be reinforced in the future on their messages.

24 MS. TRIBE: So just as Jayne, would you help
25 us reinforce that tomorrow on our work?

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Along that same line, it
2 seems it would be appropriate, in the mitigation arena, to
3 maybe be asking our friends at Waterton and Canada about
4 possibly to assist in funding the mitigation, some
5 mitigation efforts. Because, obviously, whatever impacts
6 there are, impacts both sides of the boarder. And they
7 might have an incentive to help with that when it gets to
8 that point.

9 MS. TRIBE: One thought I had back there is
10 that we might, when these recommendations come out, reverse
11 the order of what we did. So that we start with these
12 things and that, while they're recommendations that are a
13 little different than the road construction thing, that it
14 recognizes the socioeconomic issues right off the bat. And
15 then regardless of the alternative and regardless of the
16 proposed actions, you would still be considering these
17 visitor development strategies. That's just another thing
18 for you to think about tonight.

19 The downside of this was the timeline business.
20 You know, the question, will we be involved in
21 rehabilitation during the Lewis and Clark years of '05 and
22 '06. Probably not, by the time you think of congressional
23 funding and all those things, or maybe just getting started.
24 So one of the challenges will be to keep the momentum going
25 on this and really think of it in a strategic way.

1 Well, you got all your work done today. Some of
2 it was ugly, but we have the baby. I mean, people are still
3 speaking to each other in here.

4 MS. LEWIS: Nobody wants an ugly baby.

5 (Whereupon, the proceedings were recessed from
6 6:35 p.m. to Friday, September 21 at 8:00 a.m.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 --o0o--

21

22

23

24

25

1 The third day of the third meeting of the
2 Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee was called to order
3 at 8:00 a.m., Friday, September 22, 2001, by Virginia Tribe,
4 facilitator.

5 Ms. Tribe suggests the Committee read over the
6 three packages from the day before that are the verbatim
7 notes from the flip charts. Additionally, they have, in
8 memo form, a very rough draft recommendation.

9 She asks that the Committee look for the
10 following: Are there misinterpretations on the notes; are
11 there glaring typos; third, and most importantly, are there
12 things that, at this point, acknowledging they're draft and
13 we're sort of saying So far so good, they're going to go out
14 to the public, we'll take another look at them in November
15 with public comments as your final set of recommendations,
16 are there things that you just can't live with and that
17 really need to be changed.

18 She wouldn't like to wordsmith them to death; this
19 should be a "the," let's use this adjective instead, unless
20 they change the meaning. Just deal with the meat of the
21 memo. Structural comments would be welcome. The one-hour
22 period of public comment, between 8:00 and
23 9:00 a.m., they can use for this purpose, until such time as
24 a member of the public wants to make a comment.

25 (Whereupon, the Committee members review the

1 materials presented to them this morning for editing.)

2 (One member of the general public has signed up
3 for comment, but would rather listen and learn about the
4 meeting. However, as this is the designated time for public
5 comment, Mr. Babb will speak to her. Whereupon, at 9:00
6 a.m., there being no public comment given, Ms. Tribe
7 addresses the Committee.)

8 MS. TRIBE: I'd like to start this discussion
9 if I could, I'd like you to think a little bit about what
10 we've done here. This is a group of folks who came together
11 as an advisory group a year ago -- two years go. And you
12 came together the first time and you did some stuff, mostly
13 process stuff, I mean, about how you were going to operate
14 and that kind stuff, at least the notes I saw.

15 The second time you came together was a year ago.
16 And when you did that, you kind of laid out what I call some
17 guiding principles and sort of some parameters that you'd
18 like the contractors to work within, and you did some other
19 process stuff, about who would sign things and that kind out
20 of stuff.

21 And then in the meantime, the whole world changed,
22 in terms of the company changed to a new company, we have
23 new people in Joe. By the way, I've heard very
24 complimentary things, again, about Joe and Jean and their
25 presentation and how useful it was and how authoritative

1 they seem and assertive, and we can slap them around, they
2 still sit back up and, you know, all those kinds of things.

3 MR. KRACUM: Wait, wait, wait. There's no
4 way I could have done it without those two, Nick Senn, Mark
5 Bancale, Mark Hufstetler, Jean Townsend, Joe Bear, and a
6 whole bunch of people in the Glenwood Springs office who
7 really make things happen and make me look real good. So I
8 give all the credit to those guys. So give them a round of
9 applause.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. TRIBE: Well, to all of you, you gave us
12 a product to react to, first of all. And second, you were
13 there to help with the discussion, to defend where it needed
14 defending, without getting real defensive. So it was pretty
15 useful.

16 So basically, yesterday was the first day, and it
17 lasted about 17 hours, but yesterday was the first day that
18 you actually sat down and started to craft some things
19 related to how this project was going to be done. And when
20 Mary and Dayna and I and Bambi were looking last night and
21 taking turns and swearing at Mary's machine, we were amazed
22 at, perhaps not the quality, necessarily, because it's a
23 first cut, but, certainly, the quantity and the thought that
24 went into producing these things.

25 And we arranged them so that the alternative

1 recommendations are first, because they really probably have
2 the most meat. The proposed actions follow, and they're the
3 things that are the clearest. And the reason they're the
4 clearest is because it was easier for us to think about
5 drainages and slope stability and those kinds of things.

6 And we spent the least time at the worst part of
7 the day on the visitor development strategies. And so when
8 we get there, I'm going to make some recommendations about
9 how we might lay that out in a different way than it is
10 right now. Basically, we just wanted to get it in the
11 package.

12 So having said those things, I don't think you
13 should be disappointed in yourselves at all in what you
14 produced. This is sort of like the first meeting of the
15 Advisory group, in terms of starting your work, the real
16 work.

17 So I'd like to go to the recommendations on the
18 alternatives and acknowledge, right off the bat, that last
19 night we talked about the first paragraph being poorly
20 written, and we forgot to go back in and rewrite it at the
21 end of what we did. So some editing needs to be done under
22 the bold Recommendations - Alternatives.

23 But let's go to A. Priority Rehabilitation. Are
24 there things in that description that you disagree with,
25 can't live with, that we need to clean up?

1 Susie.

2 MS. BURCH: Under the second bullet, the very
3 last item, I think, just for clarification, "Changing
4 Fridays," that should be "afternoon closing to another
5 midweek day."

6 MS. TRIBE: So changing Friday --

7 MS. BURCH: Insert "afternoon closing."

8 MS. TRIBE: Okay. And the reason we used
9 "closings" and "closures" all the way through here is
10 because the Committee has not established a new word. We
11 teased about "suspension" and so forth. But to keep it
12 clear, we used the word "closure." We may want to adopt a
13 new word today and insert that before it goes to the public.

14 Any other comments on priority rehabilitation?

15 MS. ANDERSON: On that same bullet, number 2,
16 under Priority Rehabilitation, where it says "Providing
17 skilled flaggers," I just changed that to saying "Providing
18 flaggers skilled in communication."

19 MS. TRIBE: Is that okay? Are you all right
20 with that?

21 MS. MOE: Well, actually, I've kind of got a
22 question or comment. Like "Providing skilled flaggers.
23 Providing real-time information." Yes, we thought that that
24 was important, but I think that that's important for all the
25 recommendations -- I mean, for all the alternatives. So

1 whether it's, you know, A or B or C, whatever is adopted,
2 that that needs to be in all of those. And so I think that
3 we need to make sure that those elements are common to all
4 alternatives and not specific to one.

5 MS. TRIBE: Okay. I think the reason we put
6 it in there, if I remember right, your group said, Joni,
7 when you were presenting, B2, ditto. You just referred
8 back. And so because of that, we put it in both places. It
9 is in the common elements, but you're saying we don't really
10 need it here. It should be in the common elements.

11 MS. MOE: Right.

12 MS. TRIBE: Unless I hear people saying Wait
13 a minute, I'm going to assume we're okay; all right?

14 MS. LEWIS: Would you clarify one more time
15 for them?

16 MS. TRIBE: On page number 3, we have
17 "Recommendations - Elements Common To All Alternatives. The
18 Committee recommends that the following elements be included
19 in every alternative:"

20 Maybe we want to pull that up to the front, as far
21 as display, and then talk about the alternatives. But what
22 Anna Marie is saying is that the comment about skilled
23 flagging or flaggers skilled in communication and real-time
24 information, that that should be in every alternative, and
25 she doesn't feel it should be listed as a bullet in the

1 first alternative. And, basically, what we did is just type
2 up what you had. So we'll take that out, because it's
3 already in the common elements; okay?

4 MS. MOE: And I would also include in that,
5 "Assuring that information on signs is credible and useful
6 for visitors."

7 MS. TRIBE: And all those are in the common
8 elements.

9 Any other comments on Alternative A?

10 MS. BURCH: Last bullet, "Work to increase
11 funding beyond current levels." I would say we should
12 change that to "Work to increase funding beyond five million
13 dollar level," since that's what priority rehabilitation is,
14 is a five-million-dollar level. That was my understanding
15 of what that alternative is.

16 MS. HUDSON: Can you repeat what they're
17 saying, because we can't hear, and we need to be clear if
18 it's taken out, put in. "Assuring that information..."
19 we're taking that out of there because it's also listed in
20 common elements.

21 MS. TRIBE: How about if I stand over here.

22 Now, Susie has just suggested that we say "Work to
23 increase funding beyond the current five-million-dollar
24 level" or just "five million dollar level"?

25 MS. BURCH: I would say five million dollars,

1 because it removes ambiguity. Right now, the current level
2 is about -- I thought, when I talked to Dick, it was about
3 three, three and a half. And the Alternative number 2 in
4 the Engineering Report was five million dollars.

5 MS. TRIBE: All right. So that's a clearer
6 statement.

7 MR. BABB: I'm sorry; but I don't quite
8 understand that. Because, in essence, we don't have a
9 current funding. I mean, we have to compete all the time
10 for funding. So like although we have like 6.2 million now,
11 we really don't have anything that's signed, sealed and
12 delivered in the future, except a promise in 2004 to get
13 another three million dollars. So, in essence, we have no
14 base funding, so to speak, or continuing funding.

15 MS. BURCH: Should it say "beyond five
16 million dollar proposed level," or should we --

17 MS. TRIBE: Susie, are you trying to say not
18 what the Park Service's current budget is, you're talking
19 about beyond what's listed now in the alternative.

20 MS. BURCH: That's what I thought our group
21 was suggesting, was that the alternative, as it was
22 presented to us, was a five-million-dollar annual
23 expenditure. That's what differentiated it with Alternative
24 1. So I'm saying if there is an opportunity to have
25 additional funds, we've got the plans all laid out, ready,

1 let's get a little extra money and do a little extra work.

2 MS. TRIBE: So work to increase funding
3 beyond the five million dollar level currently in the
4 alternative?

5 MS. BURCH: That would be fine.

6 MR. O'QUINN: Would it work not to put a
7 figure in there but just say "work to increase funding"?
8 The alternative is based on five million dollars.

9 MS. TRIBE: All right. So that's obvious.

10 MS. PAHL: Sorry for another suggestion. It
11 sounds to me like part of the problem here is there's no
12 guaranteed funding of any level. And maybe what this should
13 say is "work to get guaranteed funding at," and maybe you
14 want to say five million. Because right now they're not
15 guaranteed anything, zero. So you can decide that, but I
16 mean, it sounds like to actually make this a real
17 alternative is if you have real funding. And right now it
18 doesn't. The Park gets what they can beg, borrow and steal.

19 MR. JACKSON: That's popped up. And it's not
20 in this report, but there's been dialogue on and off about
21 having the foundation get funding. There's been questions
22 of how the Park can do it under its existing arrangements.
23 I mean, that there's no such thing as a fixed budget. And
24 it may mean that this Committee should seek legislation to
25 establish a permanent fund for maintenance of a very

1 unusual, unique thing called the Going-to-the-Sun Road so
2 that, once it's repaired, it's going to be maintained. And
3 that's -- I know Bill has talked about this before. And I
4 think we've got to talk about that again, and we've got to
5 talk about it beyond the usual policy of the Park Service
6 so that, you know, if this is fixed right, it stays fixed.
7 That's the idea.

8 MS. PAHL: This, though, we're
9 talking -- this is rehab. You're talking about maintenance
10 funding ideas that I know is in here as a recommendation.
11 But what we're trying to get at is the rehab money, which is
12 not the maintenance fund, just so we keep those two ideas
13 separate.

14 MS. TRIBE: They're both valid.

15 MS. PAHL: They're both valid. But in terms
16 of what we want this to say to rehab, which this alternative
17 says has to be -- is projected to five million, the question
18 is, right now, there's no guarantee for that.

19 MR. BLACK: I think we're covering both
20 things. If we're saying, under the second bullet point
21 there, the first item is "Front-loading maintenance costs to
22 prevent further deterioration." Is that going to be in all
23 of the alternatives? And if that's going to be in all the
24 alternatives as one of the major criteria, then I think
25 we're -- how we go about doing it is another question. But

1 it's one of the things that the Committee has decided that
2 they want in each of these.

3 MS. TRIBE: Okay.

4 MR. BLACK: And I think maybe that's up for
5 discussion, if we want to throw at each of these, then lets
6 go ahead and make that decision and let it roll. And then
7 we don't have to get into that particular decision. And
8 then we're moving into how do we get permanent funding for
9 this particular alternative. And maybe that's what we have
10 to put out there, David, is that we want permanent funding
11 on a continual basis for this alternative.

12 MS. TRIBE: So, Roscoe, what you're saying
13 is, if we said something like "work to guarantee funding and
14 front-load maintenance costs to prevent further
15 deterioration," that that statement is common to every
16 alternative.

17 MR. BLACK: I would think so.

18 MR. O'QUINN: Now, you got two parts to it.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Let's separate them.

20 MR. O'QUINN: Your alternatives are somewhat
21 dependent on the level of funding. This alternative is
22 based on about five million dollars a year. And the funding
23 for the maintenance is common to all of them. But the five
24 million dollars a year for this one is not the same as for
25 the others. The others have higher degree of funding.

1 MS. TRIBE: So we're kind of getting apples
2 and oranges and grapes.

3 So let's go back to Susie's initial comment. What
4 she said was, change "Work to increase funding..." blah,
5 blah "to," and then Barney adjusted it, and she was all
6 right with it. "Work to guarantee funding." Is that what
7 you said?

8 MS. BURCH: Maybe we should just strike this
9 bullet. Because, actually, if we increase funding, this
10 alternative's going to segue right into Alternative 3 or
11 whatever the next alternative is. And that's how the whole
12 alternative is defined, by funding levels. That's like a
13 given. So maybe we would be eliminating most confusion if
14 we got rid of that whole bullet.

15 MS. TRIBE: And then, when we get to the
16 common elements, we can address Roscoe's elements about
17 established guaranteed funding and, David, not losing the
18 other part about funding that has to do with operations.

19 MR. O'QUINN: I don't really think working to
20 get the funding is part of the alternative analysis. It's
21 separate and apart. You're going to do as much as you can
22 with how much money you get, and it's like Susie said. If
23 you go from five million dollars to 15 million dollars a
24 year, you're going to go to another alternative. Because
25 this one is based on the fact you think you're going to have

1 limited funding. But then you've got the other issue of
2 maintenance, that's a common element, whatever you've got.

3 MR. BAKER: So then let's just finalize this
4 thing by saying we want included in the common elements the
5 following statement "Work to increase funding for
6 maintenance costs to prevent further deterioration."

7 MS. TRIBE: What I'm going to ask you to do
8 is put a big circle around that and hold it until we get to
9 common elements. And, Brian, would you kind of remind us?
10 And then we'll sort that one out when we get there.

11 All right. So under A. Priority Rehabilitation,
12 we have the first bullet that suggests that it be included
13 as a -- and I used the term "major alternative." That's
14 from my old background. But that just means it goes forward
15 for full analysis; that we keep front-loading maintenance
16 costs to prevent further -- no, excuse me, that one is moved
17 to common.

18 Actually, the only thing we have left under there
19 is "Changing Friday afternoons to another midweek day," and
20 "Be proactive on design and packaging to take advantage of
21 funds as they become available." Those are the only two
22 left.

23 MS. MOE: So I think that we want to keep the
24 "Front-loading maintenance costs" in this particular one "to
25 prevent further deterioration," because this one is over a

1 20-year period. We're not talking the difference between
2 seven years and eight years or seven years and nine years.
3 I mean, we're talking over 20 years. And that was why we
4 put that one in there, because we wanted to stop further
5 deterioration. I mean, because that's 20 years based upon
6 where we're at today. I mean, it's going to keep
7 deteriorating. So I think we want to keep that.

8 MS. TRIBE: All right. That stays.
9 "Changing Fridays..." is a keeper. And "Be proactive on
10 design and packaging to take advantage of funds..." you've
11 got the stuff on the shelf, somebody calls and says We've
12 got an extra \$500,000, can you use it? So that's a keeper.

13 Roscoe.

14 MR. BLACK: I agree with Anna Marie, with the
15 exception that we were told that there was a lot of
16 deterioration from last year to this year. And even eight
17 years from now what's going to happen, if we don't get this
18 in, is a major component in every single one of them. Yes,
19 that's a 20-year thing that we're talking about. But from
20 my perspective, front-loading the maintenance and
21 prevention, at this point, should be one of the major things
22 that comes out of this Committee.

23 MS. TRIBE: So, Roscoe, will you put a circle
24 around that and hold it until we get to common elements, and
25 bring it back then, just as Brian's going to do? And we'll

1 talk about it then; okay?

2 So we're okay on A?

3 So what we've said in A is that Priority
4 Rehabilitation is sort of the business of planning ahead for
5 the priorities, trying to get the money, and going out there
6 and getting the work done in a sort of project-by-project
7 basis as we can. And that's a pretty distinct approach.

8 So let's go to B. And we don't know if you like
9 what we named it, but this is the combination of 3 and 4.
10 Comprehensive Shared Use With Extended Seasons Where
11 Applicable. That's a little bureaucratic. So we can call
12 it the CSUESA Alternative, if we wanted to be smart aleck.

13 So this is the alternative that's pretty distinct
14 in that it uses extended seasons and balancing closures with
15 visitor use, in order to get if job done.

16 MS. PAHL: I think if I were reading this and
17 I were the public, I would think "extended seasons"
18 meant -- that I would think that's the visitation season,
19 not the rehabilitation season. So you either need to put in
20 the word "rehab" or, actually, have "shortened season." But
21 I think, to the public, this sounds like the road's going to
22 be opened longer, not shorter; "extended construction
23 season."

24 MS. TRIBE: So Comprehensive Shared Use With
25 Extended Construction Seasons Where Applicable.

1 MS. BURCH: Is there -- how would everybody
2 feel if we changed that "Applicable" to "Essential"?
3 Because I think it's important to remember that shortened
4 seasons -- shortened visitor seasons is not a desirable
5 alternative. We only want to do that where major costs and
6 logistical savings are recognized. So I don't want the Park
7 Service to think I'm endorsing, just willy-nilly, Oh,
8 anytime you feel like opening the door until July 1st or --

9 MS. LEWIS: How about the word "critical"?

10 MS. BURCH: "Critical" is good.

11 MS. TRIBE: "Critical" or "essential" could
12 also apply to whoever is doing the project. There may be a
13 critical time when they need to have this done.

14 So this alternative is now named the Comprehensive
15 Shared Use With Extended Seasons Where Critical.

16 FROM THE FLOOR: Construction Seasons.

17 MS. TRIBE: Oh, gee. Comprehensive Shared
18 Use With Extended Construction Seasons Where Critical.

19 MR. O'QUINN: In other words, Alternative 2.

20 MS. TRIBE: I added a line here that we were
21 trying on the "because." There were no because for 3 and
22 4, basically, in the reports out yesterday. So I said
23 "Combine the Comprehensive Shared Use Alternative with the
24 Extended Construction Seasons Alternative because their only
25 difference lies in scheduling"; okay? Then I said "Include

1 it as a major alternative..." blah, blah.

2 Anything else to change on Alternative B?

3 MS. LEWIS: At the top of page two, sort of
4 bullet item four, "Keeping closure periods closer to what
5 exists now where possible." I just -- I just don't remember
6 what that means relative to -- it says "Keeping" -- it's the
7 fourth bullet down from the top of the page. "Keeping
8 closure periods closer to what exists now where possible."
9 We don't -- so if I assume "now" to be today, we don't have
10 any closures. So what --

11 MR. BLACK: The natural closures of the
12 opening and closing of the road.

13 MS. LEWIS: Oh, so opening and closing.
14 Keeping opening and closing periods closer to what exists
15 now where possible.

16 MS. TRIBE: Basically, I think it was a
17 clarification of the bullet right above it.

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, then, I think maybe we
19 ought to clarify that. Because I interpreted that to mean
20 segment closures. And so maybe we ought to say "Park
21 opening and closure dates." I see the next bullet talks
22 about segment closures. And I think it's important to
23 either define as segment closures for road work or Park
24 opening and closure dates, so that -- because my concern,
25 when I read this bullet the first time, was that this might

1 be interpreted as a full road closure by the public as a
2 part of the construction process. And I don't think we want
3 to leave an opening for that kind of interpretation. I just
4 misread it, I think.

5 MS. TRIBE: How about this, and I'm starting
6 with the bullet right above it. "Addressing seasonal
7 opening and closing periods so that they more closely
8 reflect actual visitor traffic patterns and current Park
9 opening and closing dates."

10 MS. LEWIS: Only one change. The Park is
11 always open. It's simply the road.

12 MS. TRIBE: The road. This is scary. This
13 is the part I hate the most.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: And then get rid of the next
15 bullet?

16 MS. TRIBE: Yeah. Is that okay?

17 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah.

18 MS. TRIBE: Any other comments on B?

19 MS. PAHL: Didn't we -- weren't we,
20 yesterday, convinced that the alternative of the one-way was
21 out? And it shows up in a lot of -- I know it did, because
22 it was from the notes. But didn't we discuss, after the
23 group presentations, were we not convinced that
24 one-way -- not alternating one-way but that one-way was just
25 not doable, therefore, why do we want it in there?

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I had the same note. I think
2 we have to delete the second-to-the-last bullet, because I
3 agreed it wasn't going to be in there.

4 MR. O'QUINN: My impression was that was
5 something that was going to have to be addressed by the
6 environmental document, would be dismissed most likely, but
7 the analysis would have to be done.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: But that's not our job. The
9 Park Service does the EIS and writes that all up. We're
10 just saying, we decided yesterday, we were not going to
11 recommend it. So we either delete it here or we go back and
12 say considered and dismissed, not recommended.

13 MR. O'QUINN: We can do that. We can say
14 that we felt that that alternative was not one that we
15 wanted to push forward.

16 MS. TRIBE: And remember, this is not an
17 alternative. It's just a clarifier, asking the contractors
18 to improve the alternative by investigating this.

19 MR. JACKSON: Well, our intent, also, was to
20 integrate this into the analysis of the socioeconomic
21 impacts.

22 And, for instance, people that come in September
23 don't, on the average, spend as much as people who come in
24 July and August. And so what we were trying to do is to
25 kind of fine tune that stuff, in an integrative way, to get

1 a better idea of how the construction -- how fine tuning
2 this stuff would actually impact loss and revenue to
3 businesses and so on. And so I think that we want to make
4 clear that the idea is to read that better than I think we
5 have a chance to do right now. And that can be done in the
6 EIS.

7 MR. BAKER: I don't recall, actually,
8 dismissing it out of hand. I recall us saying that we
9 wanted it clarified and considered, looked at just a little
10 closer by the consultants, not as a separate alternative but
11 in this comprehensive shared use. Either it will work or it
12 won't work.

13 MS. PAHL: I think one of the things Suzann
14 brought up is that she can't tell the state highway that
15 they're only going to be able to run their --

16 MR. BAKER: And that's where we had said
17 Okay, loop is the wrong word. One-way was the key wordage
18 there; investigate one-way on the Sun Road connecting to
19 Highway 89, et cetera.

20 MS. TRIBE: Well, let's take the last couple
21 of comments and see what we can do with this.

22 MS. LEWIS: My recollection of yesterday
23 afternoon's conversation regarding investigating loop and
24 one-way, was that -- and remember, we're in the alternative
25 Comprehensive Shared Use and Extension, what the new title

1 is. That all of that discussion centered around what comes
2 up as the next alternative. And that it was not a
3 consideration under this particular alternative of something
4 that we wanted investigated as part of this alternative.
5 But our extensive conversation related to what is on the
6 notes as Alternative 5.

7 MR. BAKER: And I didn't get that. Sorry; I
8 thought it was to be included under this alternative.

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, I really thought,
10 yesterday, we agreed that we were not going to recommend the
11 one-way loop as an alternative. I thought we said,
12 yesterday, we are not going to recommend that. And I think
13 we should make that clear, if that's what we said.

14 MR. DAKIN: I agree. I felt we arrived at
15 our conclusion, yesterday, because it had been such a
16 recurrent theme in the public comment process, that we were
17 really going to advise the Park Service, in their scoping
18 documents, to explain that they had investigated that, and
19 all of the reasons that it wouldn't work, simply, so it
20 somehow addressed in the initial stages that we are not in
21 any way suggesting that it should be part of a construction
22 alternative.

23 MS. TRIBE: Okay. So the reason that it's
24 there where it is, is because we did the notes off the
25 reports.

1 Now, I kind of have the memory that when we talked
2 about Alternative 5, we had a lot of discussion about the
3 word "loop" or not, and we decide that had we weren't
4 looking at loop; that that was a furthest kind of thing
5 after construction, et cetera, et cetera. But that because
6 the public had raised it in the scoping process, looking at
7 issues -- and you haven't done official scoping yet for your
8 EIS, I'm assuming -- but you've gotten some public comments,
9 that somewhere in the document you needed to investigate and
10 then either explain the impacts and dismiss or just explain
11 the impacts of certain types of strategies.

12 And I think what this group was saying, and Randy,
13 when you said We agreed not to recommend that way, I think
14 what this group is saying is that in the analysis -- you
15 know, when you read about an alternative, it's pages and
16 pages of all kinds of things that draws a picture of what
17 would happen, environmentally, socially, biologically,
18 economically. And they just suggested that within that
19 analysis, in one of these alternatives, and it was the
20 group, I think, that was Lowell, David, Brian, and Tom that
21 suggested this, that you investigate the feasibility of
22 creating one-way traffic and that what Nick said yesterday
23 be noted in the environmental document so that people had a
24 better understanding. If you don't explore it in a
25 document, then what happens is that all the people that

1 thought it was a good idea still think it's a good idea.
2 They have no rationale other than Those guys won't listen to
3 us. So it's not a recommendation from you that you do it,
4 it's just a recommendation that somewhere in the document
5 you explore and display the impacts of what would happen if
6 you used one-way traffic.

7 MR. BAKER: That's what I thought we were
8 talking about. But maybe what we should be doing is taking
9 it out of these actual alternatives. And the wording that
10 you use, the investigate, should be put into the -- reworded
11 in the common elements? It's also in the common elements.

12 MS. TRIBE: Well, it probably would not be
13 one that would go in A. It doesn't really make sense in A.

14 So what I'm suggesting is maybe that comes out of
15 here and we look at it in 5. Because 5 is the one where you
16 use the sort of weirdo kinds of traffic management
17 things -- I don't mean weirdo, but more extreme kinds of
18 traffic management things. The more extreme traffic
19 management schemes to get the job done.

20 MR. MEZNARICH: Your assessment was correct.
21 We identified it as traffic management and also in regard to
22 common elements. And I agree with Brian's comment and your
23 additional comment that perhaps it goes in the following
24 alternative and should come out of the common elements then.

25 MS. TRIBE: It just doesn't fit in A.

1 MR. BLACK: Seems like, to me, we're in
2 conflict, if we're going to flow it into number 5, because 5
3 is the segment closure. And how the heck are we going to
4 get it in the segment closure?

5 MS. TRIBE: Then leave it here.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: No, it has to come out. This
7 is under the category of Improve this alternative by: And
8 that's clearly not what this Committee said, is think about
9 investigating a one-way loop by improving this 3 and 4. I
10 think that would be very confusing to the public.

11 I think it has to come out of this one. And I
12 think, at most, we said maybe explore it as a traffic
13 management option. But I don't think we said let's
14 seriously consider it in any of these options.

15 MS. TRIBE: Well, could we put a circle
16 around it, right now, and talk about it again when we come
17 to 5 before we dismiss it?

18 MS. LEWIS: I'm going to defer my comment
19 until we come back to it.

20 MR. BLACK: Yeah. I'd like to get back to
21 the one that we threw out there, "Keeping closure periods
22 closer to what exists now where possible." I think what we
23 were talking about were closures where you had the extended
24 time stoppage, that they said We're going to have the open
25 period from 10:00 until 2:00, and people were saying is that

1 actually the time that we wanted? Because, actually, when
2 you go through at the top of the pass, it's not busy at ten
3 o'clock, it's busy at eleven o'clock and it's busier at 3
4 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the afternoon. And I think that's
5 what, whoever was on this particular one, was referring to
6 when they were talking about this.

7 MS. TRIBE: So does this do it for you? Look
8 at the one above.

9 "Addressing seasonal opening and closing periods,"
10 if we said "Addressing seasonal and daily opening and
11 closing periods"?

12 MR. BLACK: Well, it's not opening and
13 closing. It's delay periods, because you're not really
14 closing.

15 MS. TRIBE: What I was trying to do was build
16 in the time element.

17 MR. BLACK: They're two separate things.
18 That was one of the points, if it wasn't brought up by them,
19 I was going to make is that a 10:00 to 2:00 might work for
20 the contractors, but it's not necessarily going to work for
21 the traffic road running through there, I think from 11:00
22 to 3:30.

23 MS. TRIBE: Can you offer us a suggestion?
24 What it says now is "Keeping closure periods closer to what
25 exists now where possible." And we thought that had to do

1 with opening and closing dates.

2 MR. BLACK: My suggestion is that we put the
3 extended stoppage times to more closely mirror actual
4 traffic patterns.

5 MS. LEWIS: If you count down five bullets,
6 you'll see "Utilizing current, real-time visitor use data
7 and adjusting traffic management hours so that most delays
8 are in the lowest traffic/use period."

9 MS. TRIBE: Thank you, Suzann.

10 MR. BLACK: Okay; thanks.

11 MS. LEWIS: I think we might want to move
12 that up, in terms of just getting it with the other
13 information where we're dealing with seasonal so we see
14 these things all together. But I think that's what you're
15 getting at.

16 MR. BLACK: That's what I am.

17 MS. MOE: Well, I was going to actually
18 suggest that we move that to the common elements of all of
19 them.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah.

21 MR. JACKSON: It isn't inconsistent with the
22 next one down, because we're not contemplating daily things
23 in the next alternative or minute-by-minute things. The
24 next alternative is a fast-track alternative.

25 MS. MOE: But they're also -- they may be

1 closing certain segments under the next one, but they may
2 also be doing construction on other parts of it.

3 MR. TRIBE: So Anna Marie, will you put a
4 circle around it and save it?

5 MS. MOE: I'd also like to move the second
6 bullet on that page, "Expanding cost estimates to include
7 maintenance and operations..." et cetera, to a common
8 element on all of them.

9 MS. TRIBE: And it may already be there.

10 MS. MOE: But take it out of this,
11 specifically, if it's not --

12 MS. TRIBE: So would we agree that a common
13 element would be that cost estimates should include
14 maintenance and operations, a structured communication plan,
15 visitor development strategies, and visitor support
16 facilities, and that it doesn't have to be here.

17 (A Committee member asks what "visitor support
18 facilities" is.)

19 MS. TRIBE: Those are restrooms.

20 MS. PAHL: Can we say so?

21 MS. LEWIS: Well, the "e.g." just kind of
22 goes through.

23 MS. TRIBE: So could we agree to that, that
24 it goes into every alternative and it comes out of here.
25 And you're saving your other one for me.

1 MS. MOE: If we're saving the other one 'til
2 5, I think we also want to include that in the previous one.
3 I mean, if you're not sure if it would go under C, I think
4 it definitely also could go under A.

5 MS. TRIBE: The Utilizing current real-time
6 one?

7 MS. MOE: Uh-huh.

8 MS. TRIBE: But in A, we're not concentrating
9 on anything to do with delay. You know, that would sort of
10 be a managing traffic project by project as we go.

11 MS. MOE: Okay.

12 MR. DAKIN: Well, just remember, when we get,
13 then, to our common elements, that -- and I think it's fine
14 to move that to a common element. But there's going to be a
15 real redundancy in there. There's some single-line items.

16 MS. TRIBE: Exactly. That's why I'm asking
17 different people to sort of be responsible for sorting it
18 out, so these guys don't have to.

19 Any other comments on B?

20 MR. MEZNARICH: Regarding the
21 second-to-the-last bullet discussed about the one-way loop,
22 there's one final item, "...utilize shuttle systems." I
23 think we had that as a distinct idea, that we should
24 investigate the feasibility of utilizing a shuttle system to
25 assist with traffic management.

1 MS. TRIBE: So what you're saying is,
2 investigate the feasibility of using shuttle systems. You'd
3 like to keep that in this alternatives, because that was
4 very important to your group.

5 MR. MEZNARICH: Yes.

6 MS. TRIBE: Remember, you're just exploring
7 the feasibility. It may never happen. Tony hopes it
8 happens, but it may never happen.

9 But I just can't say enough times that an
10 Environmental Impact Statement is for analysis so the public
11 can look at it and say Wow, I didn't know that would cost
12 that much. Boy, I didn't know that was possible. I didn't
13 know that would result in that. It's a public document so
14 people have a better understanding of what could happen up
15 there in different scenarios.

16 MR. BLACK: I have a question for Joe. On
17 the four-hour closure after 7:00 p.m., it seems to me that
18 if you're going to close the road after 7:00 p.m. for four
19 hours, and then you're going to reopen it at eleven o'clock
20 at night, could you get more work done if in this we said
21 that there could be road closures for the entire evening
22 after seven o'clock?

23 MR. KRACUM: Let me rephrase your question.
24 You're asking, could you get more work done if you closed it
25 for all night?

1 MR. BLACK: Correct.

2 MR. KRACUM: Yes.

3 MR. BLACK: The point I guess I'm making is,
4 if you close it at seven o'clock at night for four hours,
5 people are just going to say -- who's going to wait until
6 eleven o'clock to go across the road? Not very many people.

7 MR. KRACUM: Roscoe, that four hours wasn't
8 meant to necessary close right at 7:00. It could close
9 anytime during that 7:00-to-7:00 period, you know. And
10 personally, I'd probably make it later, if you're going to
11 make it closed, simply because you're going to have people
12 who want to go through more between 7:00 and 9:00, rather
13 than 9:00 and 11:00, say. So you could float that four
14 hours to match your visitor use.

15 MR. BLACK: Yeah.

16 MR. KRACUM: Or you could do it in -- the
17 morning hours works well too.

18 MR. BLACK: Prior to 7:00.

19 MS. TRIBE: You know, there are some people
20 who use that road other than visitors too. It's a
21 thoroughfare across the state. So I think what you're
22 saying is, you want to make that the most useful time, in
23 terms of whoever's using the road.

24 MR. KRACUM: And I want to add the contractor
25 too, because I think it needs to be a balance between the

1 two.

2 MS. LEWIS: My understanding is you just want
3 the ability to program four hours of closure during the
4 7:00-p.m.-to-7:00-a.m. time period that will best meet the
5 mix of when visitors are traveling, when the contractor
6 needs. You can give them four hours of exclusive work at
7 some area, and that from right now where we are planning on
8 that alternative, allowing for that four hours of floating
9 time, is what you factored into all the other elements.

10 MR. KRACUM: Right. And that's a thing
11 that -- you know, you don't define, necessarily, specific
12 days in the construction contract. But you make the
13 contractor say two weeks ahead of time, the construction
14 contractor requests that he has a closure on these certain
15 days.

16 MS. LEWIS: And then we can do real-time
17 information.

18 MR. KRACUM: And then get your public
19 information out. So I can't say that the contractor's going
20 to need it on Wednesday and Thursday of the third week in
21 July of 2004. It's going to be up to how they schedule
22 their work.

23 MR. BLACK: And I fully understand that. I
24 wonder if it should be a little bit more explained in what
25 we're putting out so that people don't think that the

1 contractor, every day of the summer, can close it at seven
2 o'clock.

3 MS. LEWIS: A suggestion might be that we add
4 a bullet that says, in this particular alternative or
5 anytime you're referring to a four-hour, because these two
6 alternatives are the ones where you have the four-hour
7 floating closure between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., that we
8 need to define what that is and why that is -- why they need
9 it.

10 MS. TRIBE: So here's a bullet, and we
11 might -- I'm going to add it on my paper at the end, but it
12 might work better if we stuck it up here in some of the
13 other time things, clearly explain the floating four-hour
14 closure strategy and the rationale for it.

15 MS. LEWIS: Why don't we add the four-hour
16 closure strategy is only applicable between 7:00 p.m. and
17 7:00 a.m. is the only consideration time that you were
18 looking at in these two alternatives.

19 MS. TRIBE: So clearly explain the floating
20 four-hour closure strategy and the rationale for it.
21 Clarify that it will occur only between 7:00 p.m. to
22 7:00 a.m.

23 MR. BLACK: I think we have to put in there,
24 taking into consideration the demand on the road.

25 MS. TRIBE: Well, do you think we might have

1 already said that where we said "Utilizing current real-time
2 use data and adjusting traffic management hours so that most
3 delays are in the lowest traffic/use period" and then if we
4 follow with this explanation?

5 MR. BLACK: Well, I think that's very broad
6 when you say "...the lowest traffic/use period," because
7 after seven o'clock it's much lower than it is at 2 o'clock
8 in the afternoon. So that could be interpreted as let's
9 close it at 7:00..

10 MS. TRIBE: So, Roscoe, if the bullet says
11 clearly explain and please include your rationale.

12 MR. BLACK: That's fine with me.

13 MS. TRIBE: All right. So we'll trust that
14 they're going to do that. And remember, you're going to
15 have one more shot at this anyway, if you aren't satisfied
16 with the language that we use. So we're hoping that
17 that's -- that your interest is included in that
18 clarification, without having to, in group, put down exact
19 times.

20 Are you okay?

21 MR. BLACK: Yes.

22 MS. TRIBE: Any other comments on B? There
23 you are; all right.

24 So that's the distinct alternative of fooling
25 around with traffic management, basically, and extensions of

1 seasons and openings and closings of the road in order to
2 get the job down.

3 Now, Alternative C. And a gentleman from the
4 audience, who's involved in environmental impact statements,
5 suggested the word "isolated" as helping the public
6 understand that we're not talking about closing the road.
7 So Isolated Road Segment Closures. We put the word
8 "Suspensions" there this one time, because we're looking for
9 a word to substitute for the word "closures."

10 MR. JACKSON: Well, I think the thing that's
11 left out is the fact it's the fast-track completion
12 alternative too, which is one of the things that we've
13 gotten out of the research that Jean has done, that people
14 are interested in the fast-track completion.

15 MS. TRIBE: So we might call this the
16 accelerated isolated road segment closure.

17 MR. JACKSON: No; I think it's fast-track
18 completion by isolated road segment. I think that's what we
19 want. And I think that -- I know that this is a
20 controversial alternative, but I think it's going to show
21 two things. First of all, it's going to show that in spite
22 of the fact that it's fast-track, because there's three or
23 four months of construction and elevation of 6-, 7-, 8,000
24 feet, that it's still going to cost a hell of a lot of money
25 and it's also going to have the largest impacts on

1 businesses surrounding the Park. And I think if this group
2 doesn't recognize that we've got to talk about that with our
3 public, straight up, then I think that we're kind of -- I
4 think we're not doing our job.

5 MS. TRIBE: And so this isn't you saying I
6 prefer that alternative.

7 MR. JACKSON: No.

8 MS. TRIBE: This is for the public who thinks
9 you can do a fast-track, they need to see that fast-track
10 isn't really very possible, or it's going to cost you a heck
11 of a lot of money to get it done, and it's going to cost a
12 lot in the socioeconomic sense.

13 MS. BURCH: If you go back to page one, right
14 under Recommendations - Alternatives in that paragraph, the
15 last sentence says "The three recommended alternative
16 engineering approaches include the following:"

17 I would suggest that we change that, right now, to
18 "Two include A and B," then have a section that says
19 "Alternatives considered by the Committee and dismissed" or
20 whatever is the appropriate -- but not recommended. "Would
21 include Repair as Needed, No Action, One-Way Traffic, this
22 plug method and the sprint method, total closure. And under
23 this isolated road segment you could say -- just like you
24 have Alternative examined and dismissed, you could say "This
25 was considered and not recommended because the construction

1 cost and time savings were not considered sufficient to
2 merit the socioeconomic risk." Then the Park Service goes
3 right on, they have to do what they have to do for the EIS,
4 but the Committee does not inadvertently appear to be
5 recommending this. And you say We addressed your public
6 concerns, we considered them thoughtfully, and here you go.

7 MS. TRIBE: But if the Park Service chose to
8 treat it as a major alternative, they could do it.

9 MS. BURCH: Absolutely.

10 MR. BLACK: Yeah.

11 MS. TRIBE: Now, I've got Joe and you've got
12 Linda. I had a hand over here.

13 MR. JEWETT: I'm sitting on it. But I want
14 to see where this goes.

15 MR. KRACUM: I would strongly recommend you
16 do not use the words "fast-track." Fast-track is a specific
17 project delivery method that has nothing to do with the way
18 you're looking at trying to do this. And it just would
19 cause a lot of confusion. In fact, fast-track project
20 delivery has gotten a bad rap over during the '80s. So I
21 would suggest not using fast-track. Use some other kind of
22 word. But it means something very different to a lot of
23 different people, especially those people who are involved
24 in project delivery systems.

25 MS. TRIBE: Could you use accelerated?

1 MR. KRACUM: Accelerated would be fine. The
2 word "fast-track" is the problem that I have.

3 MS. TRIBE: We've got two things going here.

4 One is, what do we call it if we keep it;
5 Accelerated Completion Through Isolated Road Segment
6 Closures? And then we have the other business of maybe
7 there's another thing we need to do with it.

8 So what I want to do is first, Susie, sort out the
9 business of so we know where we're going, in terms of the
10 alternative.

11 MS. PAHL: So we're not going to respond to
12 what she said.

13 MR. TRIBE: Not yet.

14 MS. LEWIS: I have two maybe simpler
15 questions about C, no matter what we do with it or don't do
16 it. And one is towards Barb. The words "historic
17 retention," what does that mean?

18 MS. PAHL: I think it means to retain the
19 historic features that currently exist on the road.

20 MS. LEWIS: Say that again.

21 MR. BLACK: Let me respond to that. Because
22 when we did this particular issue, we looked at it and said
23 Which of these does it work with and which doesn't it work
24 with? And we just threw that in. But I think that all of
25 them would have to work with the historic retention. And so

1 I'm not sure that this works any better than any of the
2 other projects.

3 MS. TRIBE: My recommendation is you take
4 everything off, starting with "because" to the period.

5 MS. PAHL: I don't know if I should say this
6 or not. Somebody told me yesterday and so it wasn't in this
7 discussion, that --

8 MS. TRIBE: Someone who works for the hotel?

9 MS. PAHL: Someone who works for the project.
10 He who shall not be named.

11 And so this hadn't been deliberated. I don't
12 think it's been evaluated, so it may not even be correct.
13 But that if you had the flexibility to close the road in
14 segments, that it might do -- it might make it easier to
15 retain some of the historic features than accommodating
16 fragmenting. So that actually may be correct. Now,
17 it -- whether or not --

18 MS. TRIBE: But we don't know if it's strong
19 enough to be able to use as rationale. And Roscoe really
20 explained it clearly. What they did in their report is say
21 It meets these criteria and it doesn't meet these. So we
22 took the things that it meant and strung them out but,
23 actually, these things are true for every alternative or we
24 wouldn't have them as alternatives.

25 So why don't we -- knowing that Susie's got this

1 other thing on the table, but thinking about this
2 alternative, "Include the Isolated Road Segment Suspension
3 approach as a major alternative in the environmental
4 document," period. "It may be appealing to funders and
5 could," not "would," "could result in a shorter time period
6 for project completion," period. Is that all right?

7 Then, before again looking at 5 as a weather, are
8 there any -- first of all, just the typo, it needs to have
9 i-n-g, if it's going to be consistent with the rest of the
10 format.

11 MS. LEWIS: I have one more small
12 clarification. Under the second bullet for this Alternative
13 5, one, two, three, four, the fifth item down under that,
14 "Explore the potential of closing portions of both sides of
15 the pass concurrently." I don't understand what that means.

16 MR. BLACK: That wasn't supposed to be. We
17 were questioning, when they said "segment closures," whether
18 they were going to do a segment here and segment there and
19 we couldn't get to the top of the pass. So that can come
20 out of there and be put under the first bullet point,
21 "Better defining clarifying "segment closure."

22 MS. TRIBE: And especially since we've
23 already said that they wanted to assure access on at least
24 one side of the pass. So it didn't make sense anyway, but
25 we thought you'd get rid of it, and you did.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: So we can just delete that?

2 MR. BLACK: Yeah.

3 MS. TRIBE: Anything else?

4 MS. PAHL: I still think we need to delete
5 the one-way traffic for this.

6 MS. TRIBE: So on the bottom, this is --

7 MS. LEWIS: "Explore the possibility of
8 one-way traffic" --

9 MS. TRIBE: "...on the road with a loop
10 connection...." That's the thing that you think ought to
11 come out, even in 5.

12 MR. KRACUM: I don't know if this is the
13 right time, but I would suggest to the Committee that you
14 allow some flexibility to the Park Service. When they get
15 into these alternatives that -- you know, we've got some
16 different iterations within a given alternative. And
17 because the document has to be legally defensive, once that
18 analysis starts, you may find that these iterations may be
19 different enough that you may have to add another
20 alternative, rather than to try to include it into one.
21 Because of the amount of controversy in the project, I think
22 it would be better that -- especially in this one-way
23 traffic thing, because there is some controversy about that,
24 that as the analysis starts, that maybe that gets pulled out
25 as another alternative. It may not be recommended by you,

1 but I'm asking that -- suggesting that you allow the Park
2 Service and the contractor that as they get into that
3 analysis, that if one of these iterations becomes
4 significantly different, that it is allowed to come out as a
5 separate alternative.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I would just like to comment
7 on that point. You know, it's been abundantly clear from
8 day one that we're advisory only and we were advising and
9 making recommendations to the Park Service. But I don't and
10 have not thought, at any time during this process, that
11 anything that we are doing is any way tying the Park
12 Service's hands with regard to the EIS or the NEPA process.
13 So I think my goal on these recommendations is we make
14 sure -- I don't think anything we take out of here, in any
15 way, ties the Park Service's hands. But we make sure that
16 we don't give the public the impression that we're
17 recommending something that we're not. And I think that's
18 why we need to get this one-way loop idea out of there, so
19 they don't think we're recommending it. I don't think that
20 in any way ties their hands.

21 MS. PAHL: What he said.

22 MR. BLACK: The next bullet point down,
23 "Explore the costs and benefits of a full or halfway closure
24 during the shoulder seasons," I think falls into number 3
25 and 4. So I don't know that that, necessarily, needs to be

1 there.

2 MS. TRIBE: I would agree with that. What do
3 you think?

4 MS. LEWIS: Delete. Is that what you're
5 recommending?

6 MR. BLACK: It be deleted.

7 MS. TRIBE: Well, it's already being explored
8 in Alternative B, when we combine 3 and 4. Remember what we
9 said yesterday too, when this goes out to the public, when
10 Suzann and her 500 best friends in the Park Service make the
11 decision on what happens here on this road, it very well may
12 be that the final alternative is a hybrid of these things.
13 And that they recommend a preferred that looks different
14 than any of these. So when we think about Susie's and
15 Randy's comments on recommendations, remember our job here.
16 We're recommending alternatives that we think would be
17 acceptable for further analysis. And it's not we want to
18 pull them back because we're afraid the public might think
19 that's what we want. We want a good, sound environmental
20 document. Because if Suzann gets -- she's going to get
21 sued, basically, if there are alternatives that were not
22 fully explored that were raised in the scoping process.
23 She's going to get sued. And so all we're trying to do is
24 make sure that the alternatives that are in there fully
25 investigate the kinds of things that need to be

1 investigated.

2 Now, whether you end up taking that loop business
3 and putting it at the end and saying -- like on the repairs
4 needed one -- that We really didn't think that was useful,
5 but to dismiss the notion of using segment closures as an
6 accelerated way and not looking at that as a full
7 alternative, I mean, it's your decision, but I think you're
8 tying her hands or their hands in terms of who does the
9 Environmental Impact Statement.

10 MR. O'QUINN: No, we're not. Because it goes
11 back to what Randy said. We are giving them a suite of
12 alternatives that is, as a Committee, we think need to be
13 evaluated. That does not limit any other alternatives they
14 want to put on the table.

15 When they go into the public involvement process,
16 they may have some citizen walk in here and lay something on
17 them that we've not even thought about that is a good
18 alternative that needs evaluation. So we're not precluding
19 any, we're just saying Here's a group that we think need to
20 be evaluated.

21 MS. TRIBE: So, Barney, you would be
22 supportive, then, of Susie's idea about dismissing 5 and
23 only have --

24 MR. O'QUINN: Well, I'm sorry, I had stepped
25 out. I don't know.

1 MS. TRIBE: Dismissing the third alternative.

2 Would you repeat that again so we can get that?

3 MR. O'QUINN: I don't know what it was.

4 MS. BURCH: My suggestion is that you would
5 structure this so that what we have now as A -- again,
6 because this is phrased "The three recommended alternative
7 engineering...." So I think we should change it so that we
8 say "The Committee prefers these two alternatives," and then
9 list Priority, Rehab and Comprehensive Shared Use. And then
10 say -- you can title it, phrase it however you want -- "We
11 feel that to fairly hear from the public, consider all the"
12 gambit, range of alternatives, whatever you put down.
13 Number 3, "These items were considered and are not the
14 preferred recommended alternatives with the Committee" and
15 include Repair as Needed, No Action, One-Way Traffic, the
16 Segment Closure, Plug Method, and the Sprint Method, so that
17 it's very clear what is the fastest way it can get done.

18 And I would suggest that under the one-way segment
19 closure, you say, "Construction costs, this was dismissed or
20 not considered the most favorable by the Committee because
21 construction costs and time savings were not sufficient to
22 merit socioeconomic risk." So you've got them down there,
23 they're in your document, it shows the Committee gave them
24 respectful attention. It doesn't say the Park Service can't
25 choose them, but it just shows the direction that our data

1 collection from the public leads us.

2 MR. O'QUINN: I think it's premature for us
3 to do that. I think we were asked to develop a group of
4 alternatives. And for us to come with a preferred
5 alternative at this point, I think, is premature. I think
6 that we can take some of them out. I think we probably know
7 enough about -- from our own opinion of the one-way loop or
8 the loop that maybe we shouldn't include that as an
9 alternative. But these others that we have put together
10 that we don't have enough information on socioeconomic as
11 well as the natural and cultural, environment, at this point
12 to say what we think a preferred alternative is, I think,
13 that's premature.

14 MR. JACKSON: This Committee asked Jean to do
15 a study. She reported to us the top ten other comments.
16 Number 2 is Do it now. Number 9, Close to road, construct
17 quickly, and number 10 was Leave it open.

18 If we take this out, we have absolutely ignored
19 valuable advice that we asked her to produce. And I think
20 that's kind of inconsistent and foolish.

21 MS. BURCH: Well, I guess I don't see this as
22 taking it out. I just -- and then if we're not -- if we
23 don't do it that way, then I would, at least, like to change
24 on page one that recommended -- the use of the word
25 "recommended." You can say "The gambit of alternatives

1 the Park Service has to choose from is" X. But I would not
2 feel comfortable leaving it as "The three recommended
3 alternative engineering approaches..." because I don't feel,
4 based on all the information that we've been presented here,
5 that I would recommend the original Alternative 5.

6 MS. TRIBE: So that language may be causing
7 you problems. So we might be able to say something
8 like -- and this is just thinking out loud -- The three
9 alternative approaches that the Committee finds acceptable
10 to move forward for further analysis include."

11 MS. BURCH: I don't like the word
12 "acceptable" either.

13 MR. JEWETT: Susie, I'm also not prepared at
14 this point to personally say that I have preferred choices,
15 frankly. But that's another discussion. This discussion
16 over this particular alternative, though, I do want to
17 address. Because it's been a source of frustration for me
18 for 24 hours.

19 And, David, I completely agree with you. You
20 know, I don't know if I prefer this alternative. I don't,
21 frankly. But the largest segment of the public that has
22 commented on how this should be handled has said, in some
23 form or another, Do it quickly, do it now. Barney was
24 right. One of our charges is to develop a suite of
25 alternatives to be discussed and debated within the context

1 of the EIS. We have got to put a baseline alternative in
2 here. We're sort of throwing things in and out of here.
3 But yesterday's discussion in our group about this
4 alternative was just that. How do we put together a
5 rational baseline alternative that kind of says Do it
6 quickly, do it now, don't sugarcoat it, don't try to mess
7 around with it, just do it, and have it for the public? And
8 I'm a strong advocate for doing that. I think, as a
9 Committee, if we don't do that, we are vulnerable to the
10 public, and we need to consider that.

11 MS. TRIBE: So you're not saying I'm an
12 advocate for this alternative. You're saying I'm an
13 advocate for the impacts and positive points of this
14 alternative being displayed to the public.

15 MR. JEWETT: We had, in my view, perhaps one
16 of the most constructive comments and discussions in two
17 days yesterday, when we talked about the need to put out,
18 clearly, to the public what it means do it quickly, do it
19 now, so that they understand that. And then we sort of have
20 lost that. That's what this alternative needs to do so they
21 know what it means.

22 MS. TRIBE: What it would cost.

23 MR. JEWETT: And how long it would take.

24 MR. DAKIN: Well, I'm just dovetailing with
25 what Tony is saying there. I mean, I don't think we want

1 to, in any way, subvert the NEPA process. And we're just
2 inching over the threshold of this whole discovery period.
3 And I'm uncomfortable every time that our Charter says
4 recommend to the Park Service an array of alternatives. We
5 need to have an array. We've only got four. That's not
6 much of an array.

7 At the same time, I'm very uncomfortable, every
8 time we try to tell the Park Service Don't investigate this,
9 or don't investigate that. Because I think that the
10 defensible NEPA process is to be as open-ended, as broad, as
11 all-inclusive as possible. I don't believe we're doing a
12 good job to try and parameter or boundary this great
13 investigation that's to go on for the next two years. But I
14 think we just need to get these alternatives into meaningful
15 categories.

16 So in other words, I think it's presumptuous of us
17 to think, without having gone through the NEPA process, we
18 have any grounds at all to even think individually that we
19 might have a preferred alternative.

20 MR. BAKER: In its current form, and given
21 the huge overall scope of what this actually means, and it
22 is a very broad one, segmented closure suspension, isolated
23 fast-track, or whatever you were going to use, I -- given
24 the people that I'm supposed to represent, I know that they
25 would not like to see this in there coming from me; okay? I

1 am sure that this is going to come up again from -- through
2 the NEPA process. We can say that we looked at this. I
3 know that I'm probably very isolated in this approach. But
4 given the way that it's currently worded, and the overall
5 scope of it, and also given the data from the socioeconomic
6 data that I have seen and read and that I have some really
7 serious concerns about do those people really know what they
8 were responding to, I -- in my own mind, I don't think they
9 did. I think they just gave some offhand comments that were
10 recorded that came up, Do it quick, do it fast, you know, Do
11 what's needed, I can't support C, currently.

12 MS. TRIBE: You can't support it as an
13 alternative?

14 MR. BAKER: As an alternative.

15 MS. TRIBE: Or you can't support it in terms
16 of the public being able to see what you just said, which is
17 why it isn't a good alternative.

18 MR. BAKER: I cannot support it. I think
19 there are probably areas in C on segmented road closures
20 that could be reworded and inserted into B where needed. I
21 do not think we need to personally -- we need to go into the
22 whole overall broad scope of closing the road, no matter how
23 it's going to be done.

24 MR. TRIBE: Of any closures.

25 MR. BAKER: Exactly.

1 MS. TRIBE: So you would not like to see an
2 alternative analyzed in the EIS that analyzes any sense of
3 closure anywhere on the road.

4 MR. BAKER: I don't think my constituents
5 would allow me to accept this.

6 MS. PAHL: I have three points to make. One
7 is I think when you talked about wordsmithing, that first
8 paragraph, you should take it right out of our Charter that
9 says we are recommending that -- whatever the language is,
10 but for the EIS. Just so it's clear, that we're not
11 recommending any of these that we like them, we're just
12 saying these should be in the EIS. What we're supposed to
13 do is use that language so it's clear what we're
14 recommending.

15 MS. TRIBE: Maybe we don't even use the word
16 "recommendation"; the Committee agreed to.

17 MS. PAHL: I would just use the words right
18 out of the Charter, that's what we're doing, so that people
19 are clear we're recommending to the next step. That's all
20 we're doing. We're not saying we like this, we like that.
21 And that's our charge and that's what we're doing.

22 Secondly, I still think it's dishonest to not tell
23 the public that pieces of this road, pieces of it, are going
24 to be closed to accommodate some of the work. It's gonna
25 happen. Now, whether it's four hours or it's 12 hours or

1 whatever it is, it's going to happen to do some of to work.
2 And that's going to happen. And I think we've got that
3 understood and then we should go forward.

4 Secondly, I think that people -- when people see
5 this and realize that fast is five years. And I don't think
6 that's what they're thinking. I think they're thinking it's
7 two. And it's going to cost all of this -- I don't think
8 it's going to be tough for people to go -- to be comfortable
9 with this middle-of-the-road process, realizing that I still
10 think at the end of the day the contractors are going to use
11 pieces of them. And when we get into the design, they'll
12 have all this input and I think it's going to be okay.

13 MR. JACKSON: I think, in context, we also
14 have to recommend that they look at the No-Action
15 alternative. And I don't think anyone in here is in favor
16 of no action. I don't think there's a soul on this
17 Committee that's in favor of no action. And yet, I wouldn't
18 turn to the Park Service and say Leave it out of your EIS,
19 because I wouldn't invite them for a lawsuit. I think
20 that's irresponsible.

21 So I think we should behave responsibly and we
22 should make -- we should say Your EIS ought to consider
23 these four alternatives, in a loose way, including no
24 action. And what any EIS, of course, always does is kind of
25 give us some kind of a set of benchmarks to compare things

1 with. And, typically, anybody that does an EIS knows that
2 some things are more realistic than others. I mean, I think
3 anybody knows that.

4 And I don't think that people in the Park Service
5 or this Committee feel that this third alternative is
6 particularly realistic, because we've already had some
7 insights into the consequences. But we also feel the same
8 way about the no-action alternative. And so I think if we
9 sit back and say Well, we're going to give a menu of four
10 alternatives, and in our hearts we recognize that mixtures
11 of two of them are probably most realistic kinds of things
12 for the road itself and for the public, then I think we're
13 back onto a ground that we can kind of feel comfortable and
14 agree about. But I feel like if we kind of compare what
15 this is with no action, they follow kind of the same group.
16 And they're kind of the outlines or the guidepost to kind of
17 look at other things that kind of mitigates these
18 disturbances.

19 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I'm mostly reiterating and
20 supporting Barb's point. Two things; just reiterate, we're
21 not writing the Park Service's EIS here. We're just
22 suggesting some alternatives to be considered as a part of
23 that. They're going to write their EIS, and they're going
24 to put in the stuff that we have to. But I think what we
25 need to do is similar to what Susie is saying and Barb is

1 saying. Maybe this first paragraph in the recommendation
2 section we just say "Three alternatives commended to the
3 Park Service for further consideration are the following:"
4 something of that nature, and take the word "recommended"
5 out. And it keeps the third alternative as something that
6 is still on the table for consideration, in addition to no
7 action and whatever else they want to put in.

8 MS. BURCH: I would still be happiest if -- I
9 think that a lot of the public, and this doesn't mean that
10 we're supposed to change what we're chartered to do. We
11 just have to realize that there's a perception by the public
12 that we're going to walk out of here tonight and they'll say
13 The Committee recommended. I mean, that's what I think the
14 people that I know when I go home -- Well, what did you
15 decide? And I just think that's my job to correct our joint
16 confusion that we were actually going to have a
17 recommendation.

18 If we are not going to cull item 5C, whatever you
19 call it, then I think we should add the other ones back in
20 and not put This was examined and dismissed. If we look at
21 Repair as Needed, the verbiage under there says this was
22 examined and dismissed. And what I'm hearing is we're not
23 supposed to be doing that sort of ranking, culling in this
24 Committee's work. And so if we're going to leave in number
25 5, I want to add back in, No Action, Repair as Needed and

1 the Sprint alternative, the five years, this is the least.

2 MS. TRIBE: I don't know what the Sprint is.

3 MS. BURCH: The fastest, where they closed it
4 for five years, 68 million dollars. I think that should be
5 described as well. Because these are alternatives that the
6 public should know what is the fastest method possible?
7 There's a lot of confusion. Two years is, I think, what
8 people think it could be done. So that would be my
9 suggestion. If we aren't going to rank or list them
10 preferably or cull them, then let's put the whole shooting
11 match back in there. Because you're going to pick and
12 choose -- the Park Service is going to pick and choose
13 anyway. I mean, to me, Repair as Needed is no less
14 unacceptable than closures.

15 MS. TRIBE: Okay. So let's deal with Randy's
16 recommendation on language first.

17 MS. ANDERSON: I understand where Susie and
18 Brian are coming from, because I have some of those fears
19 also in the tourism industry that I represent. And I think
20 maybe where our concern is -- and I'm not trying to speak
21 for you -- but is how this process that we've gone through
22 will be communicated to the press. Because the word
23 "closure" comes out, and our constituents are going to come
24 to us in the tourism industry and say Why did you do this?

25 So I understand what we have to do to do the right

1 process, but I guess my question would be, will there be a
2 way that this is given to the press in such a way that it's
3 exactly what we're saying here; that it's being recommended
4 for the environmental impact, all of those things, and that
5 it will only be taken under consideration, that we're not
6 telling them how to do it? If that makes sense. I'm
7 worried about the way it's communicated. I just saw our
8 friend from the Hungry Horse, as soon as I said "closure for
9 five years," write it down. So that's where I'm coming
10 from.

11 MS. TRIBE: Again, the name of the
12 alternative is not the road closure alternative. It's using
13 closures in isolated situations in order to --

14 MR. BLACK: Maybe just to back up a little
15 bit here, because I was involved with the ground swell that
16 helped create this Committee. And our association was the
17 leader on trying to say Hey, what are we going to do,
18 because the Park Service has put out three alternatives.
19 One is pretty much a Continue as we're going, the next one
20 was Close it for six years, half on one side, half on the
21 other, and then the third one was the longer one that was
22 going to take 12 years and was going to cost a lot more
23 dollars.

24 And there was this furor about What's going on
25 here? We can't have the road closed. We can't do those

1 kinds of things. So we go through and we spend a million
2 dollars and we're coming back with the same damn thing; in
3 my -- what is this Committee supposed to do? Were we not
4 supposed to recommend something? Were we -- to come up with
5 the same three alternatives and put it back out there again,
6 talk about looking foolish, you know. If we went through
7 all of this and we come out with the same darn thing all
8 over again, gee, that was really a nice exercise that we
9 spent a million dollars of public funds on, coming up with
10 what the Park Service virtually had already, you know. And
11 so, yeah, we've got better studies, we have more information
12 in the hands of the public, but why can't we come up with a
13 recommendation? We're not tying Suzann's hands.

14 MS. TRIBE: So you believe, Roscoe, that the
15 three alternatives we have now are Do nothing, close the
16 road for six years --

17 MR. BLACK: No, the three that we had in
18 here.

19 MS. TRIBE: But you believe the ones we have
20 now are the same as before.

21 MR. BLACK: Very close.

22 MR. O'QUINN: I think there will be a time
23 that it will be appropriate for the Committee to make a
24 recommendation to the Park Service. I just think that it's
25 premature. I think the complete analysis, it has to go

1 through the draft EIS. All we're suggesting now is we've
2 evaluated these alternatives. These alternatives need more
3 study. We're not through with the process. At that point
4 in time, then, as a Committee, we could recommend to the
5 Park Service, based on our studies, what's in the
6 Environmental Impact Statement, we recommend alternate X as
7 our preferred alternative. Then if the Park Service agrees
8 with that, it would be carried forward in the final EIS and
9 the final EIS written around that alternative. I just feel
10 like that we're not doing what is appropriate, if we make a
11 recommendation at this point, because we don't have all the
12 information we need to make. We may intuitively think we
13 do, but I don't see why, down the road, we can't make a
14 recommendation.

15 MS. TRIBE: So that's a response to Roscoe
16 saying Why can't we. And you're saying We probably could,
17 but this isn't the time that you'd be comfortable doing it.

18 MR. O'QUINN: Correct.

19 MS. TRIBE: There are a couple of other
20 things that I think are important to think about.

21 When we throw out this business of the NEPA
22 process, it's not just a process that the Park Service
23 created. It's the National Environmental Policy Act
24 process. It's a federal law. There are certain things that
25 have to happen. When advisory committees are created,

1 whether they are the Department of Agriculture, which hardly
2 ever does them for exactly the reason we're talking right
3 now, or the Department of Interior, they have to go through
4 the Office of Management and Budget to have their charter
5 approved. And never will the charter give to an advisory
6 group the power that they can make a recommendation and that
7 the agency receiving the recommendation can give any more
8 weight to it than the other public comment that comes in
9 through the EIS process.

10 So this Committee could very well make a
11 recommendation, today, November 15, we gather together for a
12 picnic in a year when the thing's done. I mean, you do
13 whatever, of course, you could make a recommendation. But
14 in the end, Suzann is not able to use your recommendation
15 out of an Advisory group, according to your Charter and the
16 rules that regulate advisory committees, in an any stronger
17 way than she could if I wrote a letter or if you had a
18 petition of 92 people out of Cut Bank.

19 So I just want us to be clear about the process.
20 We are able to make recommendations if we want to. I just
21 want you to think prudently about if this is the time to do
22 it and what our task is here and that is to -- and I'm using
23 Randy's language here -- commend forward for further
24 analysis in the EIS this suite or array of alternatives.

25 All we're trying to decide now is if that number 5

1 goes forward or not. And then we'll look at the other
2 decisions we have to make about preferred or those kinds of
3 things. So I just -- I want to keep us clear on what we can
4 do, what we can't do, what she can do, and what she can't
5 do. She's had her hand up, and I just don't want her to be
6 in the position to be defensive because she's the federal
7 designee.

8 MS. LEWIS: I guess what I'd like to do is
9 I'd like to maybe wait and defer. I mean, I've heard
10 excellent discussion this morning. And I think the point
11 where what does make these committees very valuable is the
12 amount of honesty and concern and need that always emerges,
13 both from you as individuals and the groups of people that
14 you represent. And one of the things that I'm sitting here
15 taking in is, I'm thinking, given this rich and very deep
16 conversation that you have had about each one of these
17 alternatives and sort of the meaning they have for you or
18 the groups you represent, what would preclude us, in
19 whatever we include in this document, as simply recommending
20 that these are the things that may go forward in the Park
21 Service's analysis, that you include how this Committee felt
22 about each one of those.

23 You're not saying -- putting more emphasis on one
24 or the other. But, clearly, I think we did reach a
25 conclusion with this Committee, the Committee felt that the

1 first alternative was not worth pursuing because it's less
2 than what's being done now. Those were the feelings and
3 consensus of why you said We don't -- It's not included in
4 our recommendations, our recommendations, as a group to go
5 forward. A lot of rich discussion about how number 2 is on
6 paper right now, combining 3 and 4. And then a very rich
7 and very honest discussion in the document that says This
8 Committee in no way endorses or supports closures. And, you
9 know, pooling together your rich dialogue as an introduction
10 to -- that still allows 5 or C to be in there because of
11 what your feelings were is that you needed to do it, based
12 on whatever these comments we've been talking about. But in
13 no way is this Committee endorsing this.

14 I mean, I think you have a likelihood here to
15 create a very rich document that conveys the heart, thoughts
16 and feelings and values that you're trying to -- that you've
17 been trying to work with for almost two years. There's
18 nothing to preclude you from doing that. It doesn't need to
19 be short and sweet. It can be as lengthy and as explanatory
20 as you would like it to be. And I would encourage you not
21 to -- to not give yourself that opportunity.

22 MS. TRIBE: Linda, would that help you in
23 your concerns about how it's explained to the public?

24 MS. ANDERSON: With me, it's just the way
25 it's communicated is what I'm concerned about.

1 MS. TRIBE: So it isn't that you would like
2 to to see C go out.

3 MS. ANDERSON: No; I understand the process
4 that we're going through.

5 MS. TRIBE: It's just that you want it fully
6 explained to the public.

7 MR. O'QUINN: I think if we went so far as to
8 make a recommendation at this point in time, we can sit here
9 and understand our Charter and understand how it plays into
10 the NEPA process and all that goes with it. But if we, as a
11 Committee, makes a recommendation and that comes out in the
12 newspapers and then it goes to the NEPA process, the
13 question's going to be Why you doing that? You've already
14 made a recommendation. The confusion is going to be
15 rampant, and particularly if a modified recommendation comes
16 out or modified alternative. Then is the Park Service not
17 doing what this Committee recommended? It's going to put
18 the Park Service in a real hard position to try to explain
19 what our recommendation meant and did not mean.

20 MS. TRIBE: So, Barney, could you tolerate
21 the kind of sort of qualifying statement that Suzann --

22 MR. O'QUINN: Oh, sure. I think that's very
23 appropriate because --

24 MS. TRIBE: -- perhaps at the beginning or
25 the end?

1 MR. O'QUINN: -- it's part of the process.
2 It's like she says. There's no prescriptive of what cannot
3 be put in an environmental document. It's part of the
4 public information process. And it can be put in there as
5 background information. We've had this Committee. It would
6 be very appropriate to put in what the Committee has done
7 and what they've come forward with, and that can all be in
8 one section as what the Committee has done and brought
9 forward and then what the public brings forward and what the
10 Park Service brings forward, and all of these alternatives
11 then get thrashed out.

12 MS. TRIBE: Well, I was looking at faces when
13 Suzann was talking. And when you said you referred to C or
14 5 and you said in no way would this Committee, but there are
15 people who would probably look very seriously at this
16 alternative who are sitting at the table. And so if there
17 was a way to make a qualifying statement that said -- you
18 know how radio stations say The comments of this speaker in
19 no way reflect the feelings of the radio station?

20 You know, if you were able to say at the beginning
21 The Committee recognized in its Charter that its
22 responsibility, at this point in the process, was to commend
23 forward -- that may be redundant -- a suite of alternatives
24 to be analyzed in the EIS. In no way does this mean that
25 the Committee endorses any one or any of those alternatives.

1 And that simply, then, tells your constituents. And that
2 may go, Susie, to the kind of thing you were hoping for, in
3 terms of not recommending the alternatives.

4 MS. BURCH: As long as the word "recommend"
5 comes out, I can live with this.

6 MR. BAKER: I think what Suzann said
7 was -- it made me feel a lot better. Because, you know, as
8 long as we can portray that in an up-front portion of the
9 document, right at the very beginning, not at the end, but
10 at the very beginning, articulating what she just said, I
11 think that would probably calm a lot of our fears. I mean,
12 it's -- sure, C is such a broad alternative and it has so
13 many different meanings to so many different people, it's
14 almost as if all the good points of the segmented closures
15 are being way overwhelmed by the other scope of closure of
16 one side versus the other, et cetera. It's too bad that is
17 being sabotaged by that, because it basically is. There's a
18 lot of good points to saying closure. Just like Barb said,
19 it's got to be done. But unfortunately, it's being -- I
20 don't know the word I want to use but --

21 MS. TRIBE: You're right. People see one
22 part.

23 MR. BAKER: It's screwing up the rest of it.
24 All the good points are being negated by the bad, in my
25 view.

1 Just going a little bit on with what Susie said,
2 maybe what we need to do is like what D says, instead of
3 being dismissed, say Yeah, it is realized to a very
4 contentious alternative and requires further study,
5 et cetera, et cetera. You can just adjust your wording
6 accordingly on the lead-in to the alternative. Great deal
7 of discussion by the Committee, both for and against,
8 et cetera, but it was decided that it should go forward for
9 further decision and analysis. But with what Suzann said
10 is, I would feel comfortable with that.

11 MS. TRIBE: Okay.

12 Bill, you had your hand up.

13 MR. DAKIN: Well, we're making progress here.
14 I just didn't want -- and I guess I was -- I can't remember
15 who I was -- if you were back to that idea of a
16 recommendation or something and if this Committee was to
17 have a preference and then the Park -- I've seen these NEPA
18 processes end up in lawsuits, and that's exactly what you
19 were eluding to, and then the environmental impact study
20 resulted in the preferred alternative that matched our
21 preference, there's a charge that it was a done deal from
22 the very beginning, it was a set-up, it was just a
23 formality.

24 If the NEPA process ended up in an alternative
25 that was different from our Committee's recommendation, then

1 the Park can be attacked that they didn't honor their
2 Advisory Committee. The Park is in a lose/lose situation.
3 Let's not do it.

4 But I think we went beyond that, and we're making
5 progress here with some kind of cover letter.

6 MS. TRIBE: I want to say, Suzann, as a
7 bridge and as a reward, she's going to get to go to the
8 bathroom. And, Brian, I want to say thank you to you for
9 walking across the bridge and saying that makes me feel a
10 lot better. I think we've got a solution here. I've got
11 two comments to hear yet.

12 The solution I think I'm hearing is that front end
13 in the paragraph that talks about what these recommendations
14 are on alternatives that we have, sort of this qualifier
15 that says In no way does the Committee endorse any of the
16 individual alternatives; that perhaps in the introductory
17 language in 5 we might say This was a contentious
18 alternative among Committee members, however, because of the
19 need for analysis we are blah, blah, that's a possibility,
20 I'm not suggesting it. And then that we perhaps revise it
21 one more time, the bullets in 5, just to make sure that
22 we're comfortable with the way 5 is described.

23 So I'm going to take these two comments, then
24 we're going to take -- it's a quarter after 10:00. I'm
25 going to ask you if you would take 10 minutes as fast as you

1 can, because it's my goal to leave here at 11:00 or shortly
2 after. So we have a fair amount of work to do yet.

3 So would you two make your two comments.

4 MR. JEWETT: I want to make one comment. I
5 was going to try to clarify the progress that I thought we
6 made. You did it, and you characterized it much differently
7 than I thought.

8 MS. TRIBE: Would you like to characterize
9 it?

10 MR. JEWETT: The progress I think we made was
11 characterized by Suzann. And what I heard her say was that
12 we can lay out a smorgasbord of ideas, recommendations to be
13 thought about, and we can qualify those with the richness of
14 our discussion, and that was a general statement that
15 provided us all latitude and calmed all our fears about the
16 fact that we were not trying to get into a tight debate
17 about what we wanted. That's the progress I thought we
18 made, which I thought gave us a platform to continue
19 discussing this.

20 MS. TRIBE: Absolutely. You spoke to the
21 content, I spoke to the process.

22 MS. LEWIS: Can I ask her one clarification,
23 real quick? And you used the word -- you said maybe I
24 started this by saying This Committee does not endorse any
25 one of these alternatives. And what I was hearing when you

1 used that, I think, what this Committee -- and I'm not
2 meaning to put words in your mouth, what but what I'm
3 hearing is that I think this Committee is at a point where
4 it feels as though the endorsement it wants to give is the
5 smorgasbord or the variety enrichment moving forward in a
6 process and not already making a decision that there is a
7 solution at this point or pointing towards solutions. That
8 your endorsement rests with Here are the things that we are
9 comfortable, for whatever reasons, individually, our
10 constituents, or our knowledge of the legal obligations that
11 the Park Service and others are to go through, that our
12 endorsement rests with allowing this to go forward,
13 recognizing controversy, recognizing need for more
14 clarification and exploring through the EIS study process.

15 In materials of an endorsement, what I really feel
16 I've been hearing from you is the -- is more you don't want
17 something being endorsed that you're not comfortable with,
18 but you're also not comfortable with also giving some
19 endorsement to what you are comfortable with. And I think
20 you're capable of articulating that and us coming up with a
21 way that we can convey it.

22 MS. TRIBE: Absolutely. And at the same
23 time, Suzann, you gave the freedom to at least four people
24 at this table to not feel that they were walking out with
25 something hung around their neck that their constituents

1 would misinterpret.

2 MR. JACKSON: I think that in all this, the
3 way we've looked at alternatives and stuff, we've lost sight
4 of what we've learned. And what we've learned from the
5 Washington group is that through very creative traffic
6 management, there's a whole huge reduction in losses to all
7 the businesses. And beyond that, through the marketing
8 studies, there's further ways of mitigating that. And we
9 didn't know that, at least I didn't, when we started. And I
10 think that's what by the process of we're doing, it's kind
11 of hammering out alternatives, which we're supposed to do.
12 We're forgetting what we learned. And what we learned is
13 what ought to be the big message to the EIS, I think,
14 actually, is that, you know, that's where the heartland is,
15 is in that. And that's why we're all showing two
16 alternatives is where the heartland is, but we haven't said
17 that in our introduction. And I think that's what we really
18 learned, and I think that's where we ought to kind of take
19 it in our recommendation statement, is that we've learned a
20 lot, through creative traffic management and through the
21 ways of looking at how to deal with businesses as they come
22 to grips with these changes in their business environment,
23 that we can get through this much better.

24 MS. STEWART: Very quickly, I just want to
25 point out that our job is to develop the alternatives, not

1 to develop the recommendations. And that's my response to
2 my constituents, is it wasn't my job to recommend. It was
3 only my job to develop alternatives which also have to
4 address do it quick, do it fast. So to me, it's very
5 simple; we're not doing recommendations.

6 MS. TRIBE: As we break, I would like to have
7 three people who have read through the document looking at
8 the proposed action stuff, they don't have much hardware
9 with it, that's one criteria, and they feel that they could
10 somehow grasp the kinds of words and put them on paper that
11 we've heard in the last five minutes -- and they need to be
12 sort of a diverse set so that they can do that staff work
13 for us very quickly while we move ahead. Do I have any
14 volunteers to do that, or do you have nominees that you
15 would like to have write it for you? And I'm talking about
16 the last comments about what we are endorsing is this
17 richness of discussion, the smorgasbord of ideas forward,
18 the lack of endorsement for a specific alternative and the
19 business of what we have learned in the process and why
20 that's so valuable to us. I just need three people that --

21 MR. DAKIN: No, but I think Anna Marie would
22 be a wonderful person to be one of those people.

23 MS. TRIBE: Because she's a great writer.
24 Linda and Joni volunteer to write that language.

25 (Proceedings in recess from 10:20 a.m. to

1 10:30 a.m.)

2 MS. TRIBE: While the gracious volunteers are
3 upstairs hurriedly writing the introductory stuff, let's
4 move on to page three, Proposed Actions.

5 MR. BLACK: Could I jump in on page two,
6 under C, for the last bullet point, and change that to
7 Explore the costs and benefits of -- not just east side/west
8 side, but if we had segment closure at the same time we
9 could have managed traffic work on the other side of the
10 Park?

11 MS. TRIBE: Would we be able to hold that
12 until those three come back? Because those alternative
13 pieces, I think, everybody really needs to hear. And what I
14 told them is we'd work on the Proposed Actions until they
15 got back.

16 Back to Recommendations - Proposed Actions, under
17 Drainage, any comments?

18 MS. LEWIS: I had a question under Drainage,
19 the first bullet, the statement that is in parentheses.
20 Does the Committee feel that they want that statement in
21 parentheses to remain in your final report to the Park
22 Service? "Committee members feel they lack the time and
23 complete data to come to consensus on the most relevant and
24 valuable elements in the rankings." Yet you endorse the
25 ranking.

1 MR. JEWETT: That's sort of a
2 mischaracterization of what we talked about. The point was
3 that we think that the rankings may or may not change,
4 depending on what the soil samples say, but we haven't done
5 the core samples in there.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Take it out.

7 MS. LEWIS: Delete the item in parentheses.

8 MS. TRIBE: B, Guard Walls. Any comments?

9 MS. PAHL: I don't understand "Strive for
10 auto-maintenance to the maximum possible."

11 MS. TRIBE: It was Anna Marie's comment
12 yesterday.

13 MS. BURCH: We wanted the drainage to be as
14 low maintenance as possible. And auto-maintenance, we meant
15 like automated maintenance, as close to zero maintenance as
16 possible. So that's built to the highest possible
17 standards.

18 MS. PAHL: Below that you say "...low
19 maintenance." Do you need this "Strive for ..."?

20 MS. BURCH: It's really redundant, actually.

21 MS. TRIBE: Strike "Strive for
22 auto-maintenance to the maximum possible."

23 Move to Guard Walls.

24 MS. LEWIS: And on the statement that's going
25 to remain in the last bullet, take "Seek rehabilitation

1 methods and design strategies that result in low maintenance
2 costs," low maintenance costs is a relative thing. So what
3 you're trying to -- is the most effective and efficient
4 maintenance costs? What's low to me -- or what am I saying?
5 What is low maintenance cost? We don't know what that is.
6 But isn't what you're driving for the most efficient?

7 MR. BAKER: I think cost efficient is the
8 word.

9 MS. LEWIS: Cost efficient design strategies
10 that result in cost -- cost effective maintenance.

11 MR. JEWETT: The most cost effective.

12 MS. TRIBE: The most cost effective
13 maintenance.

14 Now, again, I'm not considering what we did sort
15 of wordsmithing, but because of the amount of work we have
16 to do, remember, these are draft again.

17 MS. PAHL: I guess I have one concern about
18 this. If this cost effective maintenance becomes more
19 important than anything else, in terms of drainage. And I
20 think we remember in our discussions we had at earlier
21 meetings, the lack of maintenance, the lack of people who
22 could go out and clean out a lot of these culverts, were the
23 reasons why we have this trouble. So I'm a little worried
24 that we have this idea that you can get around those people
25 cleaning out those drainage systems.

1 MR. O'QUINN: Barb is right. The environment
2 that you're working in, you're going to have sloughing off,
3 and these culverts are going to stop up and you're going to
4 have to clean them out. You can't put a maintenance-free
5 drainage system in there in trying to build it. Then I'm
6 afraid what you're going to do is put words into effect that
7 you're putting oversized culverts in that are going to be
8 more expensive to try to cut down on maintenance. The
9 maintenance -- and you're trying to get around it with cost
10 efficient.

11 The bottom line is the Park Service is going to
12 have to devote attention to maintaining the drainage system,
13 once it's rehabed. And I don't think you can get around
14 that.

15 MS. BURCH: Why don't we just strike that one
16 and leave everything that we've said prior to that supports
17 what Barney and Barb just said.

18 MS. TRIBE: So "Build drainage systems and
19 design maintenance strategies to the highest possible
20 standards"?

21 MS. LEWIS: Yes. Build drainage systems and
22 design maintenance strategies" --

23 MS. TRIBE: "To the highest possible
24 standards."

25 MR. O'QUINN: Improve the drainage system and

1 maintain it.

2 MS. TRIBE: And we want to build to the
3 highest standard.

4 MR. O'QUINN: When you say "build to the
5 highest standard," you're building to the design you -- when
6 you say "build to the highest standard," I don't think we
7 want to go into that.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Can we delete this, instead,
9 of and stop at prudent, put a parenthetical?

10 MS. BURCH: When our group tied that back to
11 Joe's chart early on, when he talked about low risk,
12 moderate, high, and we were saying we didn't want to go for
13 moderate design strategies. So actually, if you want to,
14 change the wording as you write it. But the intent was
15 don't stop at medium when it comes to drainage, go to all
16 out.

17 MS. TRIBE: What's that third column called?
18 Was it highest possible, longest life cycle?

19 MS. PAHL: I want to stress, if you don't
20 have maintenance, it doesn't matter what they put in.

21 MS. TRIBE: What this group is trying to say
22 is they're affirming the priorities. And then without
23 reopening what we said yesterday, sounds good, build
24 drainage systems and design maintenance standards to the
25 high -- strategies to the highest possible standards, rather

1 than prudent. And that refers to the maintenance.

2 MR. O'QUINN: That's fine; that's good.

3 MS. PAHL: So you're referring to high-level
4 maintenance as opposed to -- your focus here is on
5 maintenance. No?

6 MR. BAKER: The whole design.

7 MR. O'QUINN: When you open and say you're
8 going to design the highest level design for a drainage
9 structure, what you're telling the designer is design for a
10 500-year storm, the ones every 500 years.

11 MS. TRIBE: You said a hundred years before.

12 MR. O'QUINN: I said that's one. It could be
13 55 years, 25 years. There's different design standards. And
14 when you say the highest design standard, you've got a creek
15 out there that at 42-inch culvert probably would be
16 sufficient, and you're going to end up with a bridge over
17 it. And that's not what we should be recommending. There
18 are hydraulic studies that need to be done to put in prudent
19 design, and let it go at that. Joe's agreeing with me.

20 MR. KRACUM: Absolutely.

21 MR. O'QUINN: Make note that Barbara and I
22 are agreeing.

23 MR. BAKER: How about the highest appropriate
24 standards then? Appropriate goes good for what we have
25 said, according to our criteria.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we've got it covered.
2 Highest possible standard.

3 MS. TRIBE: Remember that what we're reacting
4 to here is when Joe stood up there on that screen and had
5 that table and he showed what you do if you're low and then
6 what was prudent and then what was the most. And what this
7 group is simply saying is when you're looking at drainage
8 systems, go for the highest one.

9 MR. BLACK: That money will allow.

10 MR. KRACUM: One of the problems with the
11 drainage, right now, is that culverts are a size that they
12 get clogged up. And it's really difficult to clean them
13 out. As Barney has said, you do a site-specific hydrology
14 study, you size the culvert, and make sure that you can get
15 in there and clean it out. In order to have the highest
16 possible standard, you may be doing an incredible amount of
17 excavation, putting -- instead of culverts, you're going to
18 be putting bridges in. And I don't think that's the area
19 that you're recommending. That's not what I'm hearing in
20 Barney, anyway. And I'm not hearing that from Barbara. But
21 you want something that can work really, really well and
22 make it easy so that you don't have a lot of costs in the
23 maintenance.

24 MS. TRIBE: How about this, folks. I'm going
25 to offer something and see if we can move ahead.

1 "Build drainage systems as appropriate for the
2 specific site and design maintenance strategists to the
3 highest possible standard."

4 MR. O'QUINN: I'm okay with it.

5 MS. PAHL: Fine.

6 MS. TRIBE: Then everything else comes off of
7 there.

8 MR. MCDONALD: In reviewing the maintenance
9 logs and back history, how many culverts were there that
10 occurred before they had really opened up the road or before
11 they could get to, the result of just one winter season in
12 the initial string? Was there any problems like that?
13 Because maybe you can't get to that culvert. I agree with
14 the wording that's there.

15 MR. KRACUM: I know they've done some this
16 year, because they had some extra money. How many
17 specifically, Nick, do you have a number?

18 MR. SENN: Like Joe was saying, they got a
19 little extra money, and we gave them a list of our top, I
20 think, 50 sites to go visit and clean. And I would say
21 there wasn't a yearly cyclical thing. We found culverts
22 that were gunked up for years that were causing problems.

23 MS. TRIBE: Thank you, Nick, for your
24 information. And I'm going to try to move the Committee
25 along see if we can move through this as quickly as

1 possible.

2 Guard Walls. Any comments?

3 MS. MOE: Just back on drainage, I apologize
4 since I wasn't here, but just a note. Wherever it was noted
5 in your working documents, that was the wrong group. It was
6 attributed to the wrong group. And Dayna said I had to say
7 that officially to get it on record. Because instead of
8 Lowell and Dave and Jayne, it was Tony and Susie and myself.

9 MS. TRIBE: So we've got that and we'll get
10 that different.

11 Guard Walls. Any comments?

12 MS. PAHL: The slusher thing is great, but I
13 don't think we have to require that. I mean, that's a way
14 they can do it, so I would just say to "...fallen off the
15 road," period.

16 MS. TRIBE: I had a question about when we
17 attribute Blackfeet Reservation and Flathead Reservation, is
18 that the appropriate way to say it? Or should we name
19 tribes? How do you prefer, Don? Is Blackfeet Reservation
20 okay with you?

21 MR. WHITE: It will work for us.

22 MS. TRIBE: Is that okay?

23 MR. MCDONALD: Typically, they prefer the
24 Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes.

25 MS. TRIBE: Do you have a preference, or is

1 Flathead Nation fine?

2 MR. WHITE: Blackfeet Tribe, yeah, that would
3 work.

4 MS. TRIBE: What's the preference?

5 MR. MCDONALD: You can change it to Flathead
6 Nation.

7 MS. TRIBE: So we'll use Blackfeet Nation and
8 Flathead Nation. And then there's a typo here, something we
9 forgot. When Barbara presented, she said bring the road
10 surface down to 18 inches, and you said building it up where
11 possible. So we need to add "where possible" under that.

12 MR. DAKIN: First bullet, same location, why
13 would you replace an existing historical wall with
14 compatible stone? It's an existing historical wall. Why
15 would we replace it?

16 MS. PAHL: It's really repair.

17 MS. TRIBE: So eliminate "replace" with
18 "repair."

19 MR. DAKIN: Second one, under
20 Operations & Maintenance, as I said yesterday, I thought
21 that that was the weakest part of the final document. Our
22 second bullet says "Ensure that snow removal techniques do
23 not harm walls." That really doesn't have any teeth. I'm
24 going to ask you to just listen to me read one sentence, and
25 see if there could be consent to include it. The purpose of

1 this being to protect public investment. "Write and
2 implement a manual of maintenance procedures, especially for
3 snow plowing, which include annual inspection and evaluation
4 of maintenance-related facility impacts."

5 I believe that Glacier Park should, once this
6 reconstruction is accomplished, annually, and it could be
7 the superintendent or his or her designated inspector, goes
8 up when the snow plowing is done, and looks and sees how
9 well it was done and that that information is tracked.

10 MS. TRIBE: So without hearing it again,
11 specifically, do you agree that you would want to recommend
12 or list here that an operations and maintenance manual be
13 developed and used?

14 MS. PAHL: Sure; you bet you.

15 MS. TRIBE: Would you read it one more time.

16 MR. DAKIN: "Write and implement a manual of
17 maintenance procedures, especially for snow plowing, which
18 includes annual inspection and evaluation of
19 maintenance-related facility impacts."

20 MS. TRIBE: All right; Road Pavement. Any
21 comments?

22 MR. KRACUM: This is a herring. This is a
23 lot of -- we touched on it yesterday. There's a lot of
24 timber guardrail out there that is being used. Two reasons;
25 one for taking off where there's avalanche chutes, and the

1 question has been begged several times of whether that's
2 historic or not. And we've had several discussions
3 internally within our team about replacing that guardrail
4 with something that is avalanche resistant guardwall or some
5 kind of more historically appropriate. I'm throwing it out
6 there to see if you guys have any feelings on that.

7 MS. PAHL: From that committee, we did talk
8 about that. We did talk to Mark about that. And we asked
9 him, because in his landscape report he cited some use of
10 log, but it wasn't there, it was down by Lake McDonald. I
11 know what you're talking about. Go with me here.

12 MR. BANCALE: There was a fairly
13 insignificant amount of log historic guardrail up on the
14 pass. Absolutely none of that is left. The current timber
15 guardrail is all nonhistoric and is inappropriate,
16 historically.

17 MS. PAHL: So that's why we have this bullet
18 about restoring using the modern methods that we know are
19 avalanche proof but with the appearance of the historic wall
20 that was there. That's what that bullet was meant to
21 address. Am I right?

22 MR. O'QUINN: I think that's an area that I
23 was addressing yesterday; that you need to, very early in
24 the environmental process, gather the appropriate review
25 agencies and get some consensus early on, or start consensus

1 processes, on how to deal with it. I think for the Park
2 Service to try to do it unilaterally, or for the Committee
3 to make a recommendation without all the players at hand, is
4 just foolish. I think you need to get the players and say
5 Here's where we are, Here's what we're trying to do and
6 let's move on.

7 MS. TRIBE: Okay.

8 Mark, thank you.

9 MR. O'QUINN: Let the record show that Barb
10 and I have agreed twice this morning.

11 MS. TRIBE: We're getting it down.

12 MS. PAHL: On the last point about the guard
13 walls, I think "tribal members" -- I think that should be
14 something that's not quite like we're going to tell
15 them -- use different wording. The last bullet under
16 Operations & Maintenance, Provide opportunities, or Explore
17 opportunities to -- yeah, "Provide training opportunities";
18 that sounds good.

19 MS. TRIBE: "Provide training opportunities
20 for Tribal members and others in the area as stone masons."

21 MS. PAHL: Apparently, there's a member of
22 the Blackfeet Tribe right here who is a skilled stone mason
23 and already has apprentices.

24 MR. DAKIN: I was going to talk about
25 avalanche resistant guardrail. I don't have a comment.

1 MS. ANDERSON: I need a clarification on
2 "tribal members." And, Don, is that the right way to say
3 that also, "tribal members"? Or should we list the nations
4 again?

5 MS. TRIBE: Well, you wouldn't want to
6 exclude --

7 MR. WHITE: I think, when you're dealing with
8 federal dollars, they don't like you to identify their
9 specific tribal members.

10 MS. ANDERSON: So "tribal members" would be
11 correct in saying.

12 MS. TRIBE: Okay.

13 Might we go on to Road Pavement? Any comments?
14 Okay; good enough.

15 MR. JEWETT: Pave it.

16 MS. TRIBE: If there are no comments, could
17 we go to Slope Stability.

18 Lowell, please.

19 MR. MEZNARICH: The third bullet, under
20 Additional Advice. In the material that was off the flip
21 chart, it is worded more appropriately. So change it to say
22 "Increase capital costs when justified by reducing failure
23 maintenance costs."

24 MS. TRIBE: Eliminate "only" and "they are."

25 Last bullet, I crossed out "strong" and used

1 "sufficient."

2 MS. MOE: I guess, just because this is a
3 more official document, maybe we ought to take the "eh" off
4 of the first bullet. So "eh" is off.

5 MR. DAKIN: Just a couple comments, based on
6 a few years spent up there. It seems to me, that all
7 through the document, there was sort of an overobsession
8 with rock scaling. Obviously, you tip something off if it
9 looks precarious. But, you know, the stuff that comes down
10 that really does damage, comes from hundreds and hundreds
11 and hundreds and even thousands of feet above the road.
12 There's no way you could ever really do scaling with other
13 than an illusion of thinking you are enhancing public
14 safety. And also, that stuff that tumbles down is in crummy
15 shape. You would never get materials from rock fall that
16 you could use in an Ashford-style masonry wall. I don't
17 have any problem with it being in here, but I just wanted to
18 register somewhere that this obsession with making the
19 Garden Wall safe from falling rock is a fool's errand.

20 MS. TRIBE: You want to be a little more
21 direct.

22 MR. DAKIN: Yeah.

23 MS. TRIBE: Could we go to Retaining Walls,
24 Arches and Tunnels?

25 MS. LEWIS: The second bullet addressed the

1 five priority walls immediately as defined in the Committee
2 assessment and the Engineering Study. I assume that that's
3 a pretty direct correlation somebody was trying to make.
4 And I just needed some more clarification on it.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: There's reference in the
6 section we referred to there to five priority walls
7 requiring immediate attention as soon as possible. I
8 suspect they're probably already on the list of things that
9 need to be addressed. And they were mentioned in the area
10 and condition assessment. We just suggested those should be
11 addressed as soon as possible.

12 MS. LEWIS: The very last bullet, the last
13 sentence in the last bullet, "Income from the fund would be
14 used starting in year eleven."

15 MR. BAKER: Basically what we were trying to
16 get at there was the ten-year maintenance funds, which were
17 going to be front-loaded within the project costs, capital
18 costs, which is what we recommended, should last us through
19 to year eleven, at which time that gives the endowment fund
20 time to get up and running, structured properly, and then we
21 could start using the income from that fund in the year
22 eleven.

23 MS. LEWIS: And I'm going to offer this
24 comment only, not to -- only to clarify some process of
25 bureaucracy here.

1 There are no funds in the federal government in
2 the United States that are revolving, even the Social
3 Security Trust fund. So it would require this -- in order
4 to establish a maintenance and endowment fund, in essence,
5 it would require a whole new piece of precedent-setting
6 legislation. Again, the federal government only
7 appropriates money on an annual basis.

8 MS. TRIBE: Was the discussion yesterday,
9 though, that it wouldn't come from federal -- didn't you
10 talk about a bunch of funding schemes?

11 MS. STEWART: Glacier Fund was our idea,
12 agencies.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We suggested it could be a
14 combination of public funds, private funds, nonprofit funds,
15 any source.

16 MR. JACKSON: I think that's not true. I
17 believe the Bureau of Reclamation started to build dams with
18 a revolving fund that was refunded --

19 MS. LEWIS: Appropriated on an annual basis.

20 MR. JACKSON: -- the way it was set up under
21 Teddy Roosevelt, and it lasted to mill all the dams in the
22 west.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: In that last bullet, I'd just
24 suggest a couple of changes. One, I think the Committee
25 group suggested it be a permanent -- add the word

1 "permanent" prior to the first quotation mark and then
2 strike the word "and" in the quotation marks.
3 "... 'permanent maintenance endowment fund'"

4 MR. O'QUINN: Question.

5 MS. TRIBE: I want to be sure we have this
6 first, Barney.

7 "Establish a 'permanent maintenance and endowment
8 fund'"

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Strike the "and." "Establish
10 a 'permanent maintenance endowment fund'" And we
11 recognize that this is a little different talk.

12 MR. O'QUINN: Again, going back to what we've
13 said earlier, that we're just making recommendations to the
14 Park Service and have no bearing or standing beyond that, I
15 take it these are things we're giving them more as really a
16 suggestion rather than recommendations, because some of this
17 stuff gets way out beyond what they may or may not be able
18 to do.

19 MS. TRIBE: We struggled with that when we
20 used the word "advice." And we may want to scratch the word
21 "advice" and say suggestions.

22 MR. O'QUINN: I feel better about that.
23 That's some food for thought for the Park Service to say
24 Hey, that was a good suggestion, why don't we do that, and
25 not feeling like it's coming as an official recommendation.

1 Some of this stuff is kind of getting on the edge.

2 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think this goes back to the
3 notion of whether are we just advising them or are we making
4 recommendations? And we're not making recommendations,
5 we're advising them, like our Charter says. And that's
6 where it seems, to me, to meet the Charter and do our job.

7 MS. TRIBE: So we'll hold with "advice."

8 Is there anything else in retaining wall?

9 Could we go to Visitor Development Strategies?

10 Now, this is -- you know, we did this just as
11 loose and fast as we could, because it was very late last
12 night. And I know there's not really time to do this but,
13 you know, it might display better to the public if this was
14 formatted in a way that had the topic, the things under it,
15 and then it had a timeline and suggested responsibilities
16 and that it was sort of laid out in a table format. And I
17 think that the Park Service would be able to do that, and it
18 might come across better to the public as sort of a plan or
19 a suggested structure for a visitor development plan.

20 MS. LEWIS: The point I want to make is that
21 this is a page that starts out with that word
22 "recommendation" all the way across. And I wanted to see if
23 the Committee agreed that that word ought to be struck and
24 it's, again, an advisory strategy or --

25 MS. PAHL: Just visitor development

1 strategies.

2 MS. TRIBE: So we don't need the word
3 "recommendations," and we would reformat it and refer to it
4 as an initial structure for a plan or something. Would that
5 be okay?

6 MR. BAKER: I agree. I have one -- are we
7 going to start talking about any points?

8 MS. TRIBE: Yeah, if we think about it in
9 different terms.

10 MR. BAKER: Under one point here, third from
11 the bottom, of Potential economic effects, strike out
12 "Canada." It's not going to affect Canada. Just put
13 "southwest Alberta."

14 MS. PAHL: I'd like to add a bullet or a
15 sentence after the "...loop recreation experience...along
16 Highway 49." Maybe a bullet that after that would be
17 "Support efforts of the Blackfoot Nation to create a scenic
18 byway for Highway 49."

19 MS. TRIBE: Down under B, second to the last
20 one.

21 MS. PAHL: I'm thinking of work. But if
22 there's no state program -- I mean, the partnership between
23 the Park Service might help make that happen.

24 I'll help make that happen. "Support efforts
25 underway by the Blackfoot Nation to create" -- or

1 "designate" -- no -- "create a scenic byway for Highway 49."

2 MS. TRIBE: "Support efforts underway by the
3 Blackfeet Nation" --

4 MS. PAHL: "To create a scenic byway for
5 Highway 49."

6 MS. TRIBE: Anything else?

7 MS. MOE: On the first bullet point -- or
8 last bullet point under A, in there it's related to
9 short-term and long-term road construction, and that wasn't
10 what we were trying to get at. We were trying to get at
11 that there was short-term and long-term image perceptions as
12 a result of road construction. So even then, after road
13 construction finished, there would still be a lag time where
14 the perception and image out there was that it was still
15 going on.

16 MS. TRIBE: So these are the -- under
17 Challenges/Issues. And you're saying that the bullet is
18 "Image problems including stewardship image tarnished by
19 perceptions related to short and long-term road
20 construction."

21 MS. LEWIS: Short, long-term and post-term?

22 MS. TRIBE: Yeah.

23 MS. MOE: Yeah.

24 MR. BAKER: On B, third from -- or second
25 from the bottom, it says "Explore an initiative to

1 create..." I think we should maybe take out "a loop
2 recreational" and insert -- instead, it should say "...to
3 create additional touring experiences (cultural, historical
4 and natural value experience) connecting to Highways 49, 89,
5 and 17."

6 MS. TRIBE: I think we just cleaned that one
7 up, I mean, before.

8 MR. BAKER: Well, I think that's what it
9 should say, though. Because not all of them are loops.

10 MS. PAHL: Maybe that's a separate idea. But
11 this idea was to kind of following up on what
12 BNESA -- about, you know, that they wanted to do some
13 interpretation and pull-offs along Highway 2. So it's not
14 just loop things off of it, but it is the trail so to speak.

15 MR. BAKER: That's what I'm saying.

16 MS. PAHL: Well, what I just heard was that
17 it would be greater access from, as opposed to.

18 MR. BAKER: No, that's not what I mean.

19 MS. TRIBE: So in case we have two things
20 here. Barbara, what you suggested here as support efforts
21 underway by the Blackfeet Nation to blah, blah, blah.

22 MS. PAHL: That's separate.

23 MS. TRIBE: But then, in addition to that,
24 "Explore" -- would you now read your new one?

25 MR. BAKER: Maybe instead of "...an

1 initiative," we should put "Explore the creation of
2 additional touring experiences (cultural, historical and
3 natural value experiences) connecting to Highway 49, 89 and
4 17."

5 MR. TRIBE: Is that all right?

6 MR. JEWETT: I don't understand the
7 distinction.

8 MS. PAHL: It's the "connecting to" part that
9 I'm having trouble with.

10 MR. BAKER: Because not all of them are
11 loops. If you can come up with a different word than
12 "connecting to" or "along."

13 MS. TRIBE: So would you say it one more
14 time, for Mary's sake.

15 MR. BAKER: "Explore the creation of
16 additional touring experiences (cultural, historical natural
17 value experience) along Highways 49, 89 and 17."

18 MS. PAHL: That's not what we had.

19 MS. TRIBE: You had Highway --

20 MS. PAHL: 2, and 89.

21 MR. BLACK: So you want to add 17?

22 MR. DAKIN: Add 17.

23 MR. BAKER: Chief Mountain Highway,
24 international highway.

25 MS. LEWIS: I didn't know it was 17.

1 MS. TRIBE: I'm going to see if we can move
2 to the Recommendations - Specific Visitor Development
3 Strategies.

4 The first one is Upgrading Public Transportation
5 to and through the Park. Excuse me, not recommendations.
6 These are just part of the strategies.

7 And do you have any problem with the bullets that
8 are under those?

9 Number 2, Improve Roads Adjacent to the Park. Any
10 disagreement with the bullets underneath those?

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we ought to change
12 the definition of that, the heading, to address the notion
13 that the North Fork folks came in here and asked that the
14 North Fork Road be improved as a part of this process. And
15 it's clearly beyond what -- the Park Service can't improve
16 roads outside the Park and way beyond our mandate. But I
17 think to avoid any confusion over that, we should not --

18 MS. TRIBE: Would you give us a suggestion,
19 please?

20 MS. LEWIS: I was going to suggest that you
21 can leave the category, but the first bullet should indicate
22 that any improvement to roads adjacent to the Park will have
23 to be done by the local jurisdiction, rather than the
24 National Park Service. I mean, it's sort of like the
25 Committee recognizes that -- I mean, it's fine for you,

1 twice, to recommend that there ought to be more work or more
2 conversations, but --

3 MS. PAHL: We're recommending dialogue.

4 MS. TRIBE: How about "Recognizing
5 jurisdictions, work to improve the relationship between
6 Glacier National Park or among" --

7 MS. PAHL: I think we to should change the
8 word to "communicate" or "dialogue."

9 CHAIRMAN OGLE: The word "improve" might mean
10 reconstruct.

11 MS. TRIBE: How about "facilitate dialogue"?

12 So "Recognizing jurisdictions, facilitate dialogue
13 among the Park, the Department of Transportation, local
14 tribal governments."

15 MS. LEWIS: Do you want to remove the word
16 "improvement"?

17 MS. PAHL: No; put "facilitate dialogue."

18 CHAIRMAN OGLE: "Facilitate t dialogue with
19 roads adjacent to the Park."

20 MS. TOWNSEND: I have a general question as
21 you go over these mitigation strategy remarks. Are these
22 remarks refinements to the text? And where your remarks
23 like we just chatted are inconsistent with the text, they
24 replace what's in the text, or is this now your total
25 statement about each of those remarks, each of those

1 strategies? I don't know which.

2 MS. LEWIS: Good point.

3 MS. PAHL: Randy, you should answer that
4 question, because you're the chair.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think these are just
6 intended to amplify. This isn't a replacement of what was
7 in the text. That would be my thought. I don't know what
8 the rest of the group thinks.

9 MS. STEWART: I have a comment. It says what
10 we did, and that's what we did, focused on, was expand the
11 descriptions of specific measures.

12 MS. TOWNSEND: And in some cases you did just
13 that, and in other cases, like what you were just talking
14 about, your remarks change what was in the text, which is
15 perfectly fine, I'm just trying to understand what you mean.

16 MS. PAHL: This particular remark is a hot
17 one.

18 MS. TOWNSEND: Yes, it is.

19 MS. PAHL: Because we had testimony last year
20 from the group that wants the Park Service, and believes
21 it's their job, to pave the road. And I think that --

22 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Pave the North Fork Road.

23 MS. PAHL: And I don't think we should -- I
24 think we are right to amplify, using Randy's word, that
25 that's great, except it's not in their jurisdiction to do

1 that. And I think it's appropriate for us to respond the
2 way we have, to be honest with you.

3 MR. DAKIN: I do think if you look at number
4 4, which we aren't to yet, we have Upgrade and Winterize
5 Historic Hotels. But we've obviously said we don't believe
6 winterizing is what we're going to do. So to avoid
7 contradicting our titles with our texts, we are rewording
8 some of these bullet lines.

9 MS. TOWNSEND: In some cases, you did.

10 MS. TRIBE: And, again, I think Jean's
11 question is a real important one, because it goes to What
12 are you going to do with this stuff? And this, I'm
13 assuming, is not just to alter the text or support the text
14 but you're going to use this to go forward with action
15 planning about what you're going to do.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I still think it goes back to
17 the discussions we've had before. All we're doing is giving
18 some advice. And they're going to take into consideration
19 the books and this document, all the rest of it, when they
20 go forward. I don't think it's exclusive of what's in the
21 text. It's just amplifying it a bit. But they're going to
22 take into consideration studies in the text.

23 MS. LEWIS: I was just going to suggest that
24 the text stands as part of a final document; correct? The
25 original text we worked from stands as part of the final

1 document; is that correct?

2 MS. TOWNSEND: I don't know that in a correct
3 answer or question.

4 MS. LEWIS: The text you provided us to work
5 from yesterday has its roots in the final socioeconomic
6 document; correct?

7 MS. TOWNSEND: Yes.

8 MS. LEWIS: So this information, I think,
9 then, can be used in two ways. It can be an expansion upon
10 that original document and as additional advice for the Park
11 Service to use in whatever way that it can. I mean, I see
12 it as a -- you've got the original document as it stands,
13 but we did some more work on it.

14 MS. PAHL: I just think I want to clarify a
15 point you made. We don't exist after November 15th, as a
16 group. So in terms of how we're going to move forward, I
17 don't think we're going to move forward on anything, except
18 that this is -- that the advice we give to the Park Service.
19 And we all become entities we were before. And what happens
20 there is something else.

21 MS. TRIBE: So when Linda Anderson said today
22 when, I think, we drafted our strategic planning agenda,
23 I'll be a part of, it is going to reflect around the things
24 she's got here. So as a group, you're not going to do it.
25 But there are people at the table who are going to carry

1 these ideas forward into some actions, because many of these
2 things are not the Park Service responsibility. They're
3 simply the visitor development strategies.

4 MR. BAKER: But it's like Suzann said. We
5 have read the data provided to us. We have made the
6 following assessments based on that data. Here they are.
7 Some are replaced -- we feel should be replaced, some should
8 be massaged differently, but this is what our thoughts are.

9 MS. TRIBE: And we did it in a very short
10 period of time at a time of day when we were tired. And so
11 the quality of the product probably reflects that a little
12 bit too.

13 MR. BLACK: To follow along on that, we're
14 giving advice to those that are going to take it forward.
15 They don't have to take our advice if they're going to take
16 it forward.

17 MS. TRIBE: That's right. I think there are
18 pieces in here for everybody at the table.

19 Now, having said those things, are there any other
20 comments on -- I'm going forward here on number 3.

21 MR. JEWETT: Can you tell me what we did to
22 number 2?

23 MS. TRIBE: Number 2 says, in the first
24 bullet "Recognizing local jurisdictions, facilitate dialogue
25 among Glacier National Park, the Department of

1 Transportation and local tribal governments." And it just
2 underscores the business of how important the relationships
3 are.

4 MR. JEWETT: Can we keep the title Improve
5 Roads Adjacent --

6 MR. TRIBE: No. We took "Improve" off and
7 we're now calling it "Facilitating Dialogue to Roads
8 Adjacent to the Park".

9 MR. BAKER: Sorry, but that just tweaked
10 something on me, what Tony said. That has a completely
11 different meaning from what that action plan was. One of
12 the action plans was to improve the roads adjacent to the
13 Park. It's not saying Glacier National Park had to do it,
14 but it said the roads need improving adjacent to the Park.
15 And what we're saying is we want to take out "improvement"
16 and just put roads adjacent to the Park, we want to have
17 dialogue to do what; make sure they look nice, make sure
18 there's adequate drainage.

19 MR. JACKSON: There was also recognition,
20 early on, there were some highway projects on Highway 2 and
21 Highway 49 --

22 FROM THE FLOOR: 89.

23 MR. JACKSON: -- that we wanted to
24 coordinate, that all that stuff didn't happen
25 simultaneously. We also had dialogue on both sides of the

1 North Fork, which isn't a Park Service road, and it's not a
2 state road either. And so it seems to me that there's got
3 to be some ongoing coordination. That's clear. Everybody
4 says that. And further dialogue; okay? We don't want to
5 take a position on the North Fork Road in here, do we?

6 MR. JEWETT: We don't want to give the
7 impression that we want that. That's just like stepping
8 into something we might have to fight.

9 MR. JACKSON: But I think we should kind of
10 suggest the Park Service coordinate construction activity,
11 which I think they're doing, and so is the state.

12 MS. PAHL: I have no problem putting back
13 "Improve Roads Adjacent to the Park." I think the first
14 bullet, which I think we assigned to the Park Service, is
15 this dialogue. What we would like the Park Service to do is
16 to facilitate the dialogue, and maybe we should add
17 "coordination" in there. But I don't think we're suggesting
18 improve roads just adjacent to the Park as a Park Service
19 objective.

20 MS. TRIBE: I'm going to suggest here what's
21 on the table. We keep the title Improve Roads Adjacent to
22 the Park, or Exploring.

23 MR. JEWETT: I would object to that.

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I do too. I think that's
25 going to play into the hands of a very volatile group over

1 in the North Fork. I don't think we want to play into that.

2 MS. TRIBE: Can we take the word "improve"
3 out and simply have Roads Adjacent to the Park?

4 MR. O'QUINN: I think what we're trying to
5 say is the Park is not an entity in isolation, and there's a
6 road that we're talking about improving. There are roads
7 that are the responsibility of the Montana DOT, and there
8 needs to be coordination and dialogue between the Park
9 Service and the Montana DOT and the political entities that
10 control that to have a coordinated effort to improve
11 transportation system. That's what we're trying to say.

12 MS. TRIBE: Exactly. So what we're trying to
13 do here is have a title that does not suggest that the
14 Committee supports improving or bringing to a higher
15 standard certain roads, because we have not had that
16 discussion, that is not part of our Charter, this is just a
17 strategy about visitor development.

18 MR. O'QUINN: Why don't you just call it
19 Local transportation needs?

20 MS. LEWIS: Local transportation
21 coordination.

22 MS. TRIBE: Suzann is suggesting Local
23 transportation coordination. And the first bullet says
24 "Recognizing local jurisdictions, facilitate and coordinate
25 dialogue among Glacier National Park, Montana Department of

1 Transportation and tribal governments."

2 Second bullet, "Promote discussion between
3 Glacier, GAIN and BNESA" -- and I changed "facilitate
4 discussion" to "promote discussion" because "facilitate" is
5 a much stronger action than "promote" for the Park; okay?

6 All right; let's go to 3, Upgrade and Construct
7 Outside Amphitheater.

8 Any comments?

9 Number 4, Upgrade and Winterize Historic Hotels
10 for Year Round Use.

11 Any comments?

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think we said delete winter
13 activity.

14 MS. TRIBE: And we said winterize is
15 outside --

16 MS. LEWIS: I think, drop "winterize" from
17 the title.

18 MR. DAKIN: Then you have to take out "year
19 round use" too.

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Fine.

21 Use Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Events to
22 Introduce Visitors Activities other than Travel on the Road.

23 MS. MOE: I think we also want to include, as
24 far as partners, to work with the Montana Lewis and Clark
25 Bicentennial Commissions.

1 MS. LEWIS: At the end of the first bullet?

2 MS. MOE: Or before "Glacier Country/Travel
3 Montana."

4 MR. TRIBE: So it reads "Take advantage of
5 the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial planned for 2003-2006 and
6 in Montana 2005-2006 working through the Lewis and Clark
7 Bicentennial Commissions, Glacier Country/Travel Montana."

8 Anything on number 6; Improve Hyperlinks and
9 Websites?

10 Number 7, Change Visitor Prospect Information to
11 Introduce Sites other than the Road.

12 Number 8, Develop Information and Add National
13 Park Service Staff to Improve the Visitor Experience Who are
14 Stopped by Rehabilitation of the Road. We'll clean that up.

15 Number 9, The Public Information Program.

16 Any comments?

17 MR. DAKIN: Back to number 8, "Working
18 through the Concessions Division" --

19 MS. LEWIS: I was going to suggest we just
20 say "Park." That's -- I don't think we want to get that
21 specific, that you would want to get that specific and
22 assign --

23 MS. TRIBE: So "Working through the Park..."
24 and get Linda's cookie recipe.

25 Number 10, Manage the Media More Effectively.

1 Would the media get up here so we could manage them?

2 MR. DAKIN: I was in that group, and we
3 specifically suggested that managing the media is not what
4 we were talking about, that that has almost an unpleasant
5 connotation. We suggested utilize and inform the media more
6 effectively.

7 MS. TRIBE: So they still might not be --

8 MR. DAKIN: Can't herd cats; can't manage
9 media.

10 MS. LEWIS: Say "work with and inform"?

11 MS. TRIBE: So that way it's a two-way use.
12 "Work With and Inform Media More Effectively."

13 MS. ANDERSON: All I would suggest on that is
14 there isn't just local media. There's local, regional,
15 national, and international. And maybe just put that in
16 parentheses or something.

17 MS. TRIBE: So provide local and expanded
18 regional, national and, okay, international.

19 MS. ANDERSON: It's an International Peace
20 Park.

21 MS. TRIBE: So "Provide local, regional,
22 national and international with good and accurate
23 information."

24 11. Improve Awareness of Events and Expand
25 Opportunities.

1 MR. DAKIN: The second bullet needs to be
2 clarified.

3 MS. TRIBE: We even have a note that we
4 needed you to clarify that.

5 MR. DAKIN: It should say "Increase
6 Participation and Awareness of Waterton-Glacier
7 International Peace Park Heritage Tourism Strategy. Because
8 that's the official name of it.

9 MS. TRIBE: Anything else?

10 MR. MCDONALD: The first bullet, the obvious
11 thing is adding the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes
12 for heritage tours.

13 MS. LEWIS: Didn't we use Flathead Nation?

14 MS. TRIBE: On both?

15 MR. MCDONALD: Either one is appropriate.

16 MR. BLACK: Virginia, on that first bullet,
17 what we meant was to also facilitate heritage tours on the
18 reservation as well.

19 MS. TRIBE: In Glacier Park and on the
20 reservation.

21 MS. PAHL: Reservations.

22 MR. MCDONALD: No. We wouldn't want the Park
23 Service to facilitate our own tours on our reservation. We
24 will do that. I mean, to help us.

25 MS. TRIBE: How about "promote"?

1 MS. PAHL: How about "work with"?

2 MR. MCDONALD: We have our own native event
3 tours that are already established, so I think --

4 MS. PAHL: Then you do want the Park Service
5 to promote your tours.

6 MR. MCDONALD: Maybe. I guess, okay.

7 MS. TRIBE: Like advertise them. I'm
8 thinking of --

9 MR. MCDONALD: Well, they don't advertise.

10 MR. TRIBE: Sandwich boards.

11 MS. LEWIS: How about using a title which is
12 Improve Awareness?

13 MS. TRIBE: So here's the bullet.
14 "Facilitate Heritage Tours in Glacier Park." You're
15 not -- only applies to the reservations?

16 MS. LEWIS: It's about Native American
17 heritage.

18 MS. LEWIS: "And improving the awareness of
19 it." Improve awareness of heritage tours being conducted by
20 the Blackfeet and Flathead Nations.

21 MR. BAKER: I just kind of realized that my
22 changes that I made to that second point, that that -- the
23 Waterton-Glacier tourism strategy, the native heritage
24 element, is one part of that. This strategy is much broader
25 than just that one bullet. And I'm wondering if maybe we

1 shouldn't put it somewhere else or have it on its own.

2 MS. TRIBE: So what's your suggestion?

3 MR. BAKER: Well, my first suggestion would
4 be to have it as its own separate point.

5 MS. TRIBE: Go ahead and give it to us.

6 MR. BAKER: Because it includes so much more
7 than the Native American heritage part of it.

8 MS. PAHL: And we put it there at Jayne's
9 recommendation, because it was a model for this
10 particular --

11 MR. BAKER: But it's much broader than that.
12 And I'm wondering if it should be a bullet as its own right
13 after that.

14 MS. PAHL: But not under this one.

15 MR. BAKER: Give it number 11A or 12 and
16 renumber the rest.

17 MS. TRIBE: So you mean, it would be its own
18 set of strategies. Well, then, we'd put it under Additional
19 Ideas.

20 MR. BAKER: Fine.

21 MS. TRIBE: Could we go back to page six B,
22 under B? Would you give us the bullet, Brian, please?

23 MR. BAKER: What I just read. "Increase
24 participation and awareness of the Waterton-Glacier
25 International Peace Park heritage tourism strategy."

1 MS. TRIBE: Thank you.

2 Number 12, Visitors Centers Broadened at the East
3 and West Entrances. Any change?

4 MS. LEWIS: My question was, did someone mean
5 visitor center services; broaden the visitor center? Was
6 that meant to be "services"; visitor center services
7 broadened?

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think so; visitor center
9 services, or was it the building?

10 MS. ANDERSON: It was the building is what we
11 were talking about. Having a visitor center on the west
12 side.

13 MS. TRIBE: So this is visitor centers
14 facilities broadened.

15 MR. DAKIN: Maybe it means improved.

16 MR. BAKER: Or enhanced.

17 MS. LEWIS: Could it be, Linda, what your
18 group might have been wanting to say, in essence, was to
19 endorse the construction of a visitor center on the west
20 side? In all honesty, is that what your group wanted to do
21 here?

22 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah.

23 MR. JEWETT: We had talked about trying to
24 integrate with the GMP plan to build that visitor center
25 with the goal of greatly enhancing visitor center services.

1 MS. LEWIS: So we have to change the title.

2 MS. TRIBE: Could we call the title something
3 like Expanded Visitor Center Facilities, and then the bullet
4 is "Endorse" --

5 MR. O'QUINN: I don't think you need to say
6 "expand." Just say "visitor."

7 MS. TRIBE: Visitor Center Facilities. And
8 then, Suzann, would you give us the statement you had again?

9 MS. LEWIS: "Endorse construction of west
10 side visitor center for the purpose of expanding" -- well,
11 "as called for in the GMP."

12 MR. BABB: I thought there was also
13 discussions of improving the east side visitor center.

14 MR. JEWETT: As called for in the GMP.

15 MS. TRIBE: Next bullet; "Improve the east
16 side visitor center" --

17 MS. LEWIS: "As called for in the GMP."

18 MS. TRIBE: Number 13, Open More of Glacier
19 National Park to Visitors and Market New Venues.

20 MR. JEWETT: I don't like the term "open."
21 It's all open. I would just say "promote." It's open, it's
22 just not --

23 MS. TRIBE: So Promotion of Glacier Park to
24 Visitors and Marketing New Venues.

25 MS. LEWIS: Just Promote Glacier National

1 Park.

2 MR. JEWETT: Promote Glacier Park's
3 Opportunities beyond Going-to-the-Sun Road.

4 MR. DAKIN: I was on the group that worked on
5 number 13, and it's another one of those cases where we felt
6 that title was not necessarily in compliance with the
7 management plan for the Park. Obviously, we are not asking
8 the National Park Service to funnel people into the North
9 Fork. So I think we need to rework what the title of number
10 13 is. Wasn't that what we were working on, Anna Marie?

11 MR. BAKER: I like Tony's wording, what he
12 said. I can't remember what he said, but I liked it.

13 MS. TRIBE: You said "Promote Glacier
14 National Park Opportunities beyond Going-to-the-Sun Road."
15 Is that okay?

16 MS. MOE: And then under the bullet, put it
17 was within the confines of the General Management Plan.
18 Because we didn't want to focus attention to areas where
19 they didn't have the capacity.

20 MS. TRIBE: Okay. So "Refocus attention,
21 interpretation and education on additional areas through
22 National Park Service efforts within the direction of the
23 General Management Plan."

24 Number 14, Continue Improving Customer Service
25 Through Hospitality Training. Any comments?

1 MS. MOE: I guess I'm uncomfortable with the
2 way that this is worded, because it sounds like Travel
3 Montana is going to provide customer service training for
4 everybody. I mean, we help support the Super Host program
5 in Travel Montana, but I guess I'm not sure what that means.

6 MS. TRIBE: If you took the front end off and
7 said "Take advantage of the State Super Host program" and at
8 11:28 Dayna and I said some really bad things about both of
9 them, and then we went to sleep.

10 MS. PAHL: We understand this was late, but
11 this isn't exactly what we said.

12 MS. ANDERSON: I think where we were trying
13 to go with that was to encourage funding of the Super Host
14 program through Travel Montana and Glacier Country and the
15 other regions that surround Glacier Park.

16 MS. TRIBE: So encourage funding of the
17 state's Super Host program.

18 MS. LEWIS: Drop out the ambassador plan.

19 MS. ANDERSON: But then we are talking about
20 the ambassador program with the concessionaires within the
21 Park, but making sure that they were taking the same kind of
22 a program through your program.

23 MS. TRIBE: So "Encourage funding of the
24 state Super Host program through Travel Montana and Glacier
25 Country."

1 MS. ANDERSON: "And other tourism regions."

2 MS. TRIBE: Second bullet, "Assure that the
3 National Park Services Ambassador Program is used
4 effectively in Glacier National Park."

5 Number 15, Improve Cooperation Among Economic
6 Development Organization. Any comments?

7 MS. STEWART: I think that should be "Glacier
8 Country" instead of "Glacier County."

9 MS. TRIBE: Okay; no comments.

10 MR. JEWETT: I don't have a comment on that.

11 We have 15 minutes left. I have a commitment to
12 be on a conference call, based upon the schedule that we've
13 set, so I'm going to leave.

14 I want to know how we are using those 15 minutes,
15 because I want two or three of them to talk about something
16 that I'd like to speak to the group about.

17 MS. TRIBE: What I'd like to do, before you
18 leave, is look at that paragraph that was just handed to you
19 and see if we can approve it as part of the introduction,
20 come to agreement on if we're going to keep 3 in there as
21 one of the alternatives.

22 MR. JACKSON: I have an item that won't take
23 a second but I think is important to do.

24 MS. TRIBE: I'd like to finish these two
25 things too.

1 MS. MOE: Just where they broke the
2 paragraphs, we need to adjust that a little bit.

3 MS. TRIBE: I'm hoping you had a minute to
4 look at this. Would you like just one minute to read
5 through this before we make comments, or are you ready?

6 Any comments?

7 MS. MOE: The first sentence in paragraph two
8 needs to be up at the end of paragraph one, and that's part
9 of the purpose, as defined within the Charter.

10 And so the second paragraph would start with
11 "After extensive and rich discussion...."

12 MS. TRIBE: Any other comments?

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Just a couple minor things.
14 I don't know that we need "purpose" be in line one. I think
15 it could come out. And I think the first word in line two
16 of paragraph three is -- that should be "gleaned."
17 Otherwise, I think it's good, very good.

18 MR. DAKIN: There needs to be -- last
19 sentence, second paragraph, "...the National Park
20 Service...." The one word I stumbled over, the third
21 paragraph, third line, "...Committee feels these options
22 need to move forward to provide a wide range of
23 consideration" -- I'm okay. I don't have a better idea.

24 MS. TRIBE: All right.

25 MS. MOE: That "consideration," it should be

1 plural.

2 MR. BAKER: Paragraph two, the only sentence
3 that's left, "...the Committee commends forward...." I
4 don't think we should, I just think the Committee should
5 forward.

6 MR. BLACK: Is there the possibility of
7 putting a sentence in there saying something to the effect
8 that we feel that a solution might be found in 2 and 3?

9 MR. O'QUINN: No; disagree.

10 MS. TRIBE: You know, you might want to
11 revise that idea in November, after you see the public
12 comments on these. I don't want to say stuff, so I want to
13 make sure that this comes out and we talk about it. And I
14 know we're limited on time, but at the same time, I don't
15 want to just dismiss it. You had two responses back from
16 Committee members that said no, they're not ready. So what
17 do you think? How many people in the room --

18 MR. O'QUINN: I think we've already been
19 through that.

20 MS. TRIBE: I'm going to ask for a relative
21 vote. And this is not -- I just want to see where we are.

22 How many people in the room feel that they would
23 be ready at this point to make -- to have a preference
24 statement about an alternative, stand up, please. Feel they
25 are ready at this point to be able to do that.

1 MS. BURCH: May I ask for a clarification? I
2 am personally ready. I am ready as a representative that I
3 was sent here to represent. However, I have been convinced
4 this morning that it's not appropriate to ask for a vote at
5 this time as asked me for. Can I tell you where I stand and
6 where I will continue to stand?

7 MS. TRIBE: Then maybe I should ask the
8 question in a different way.

9 Would the people in the room who feel that we
10 should not make a statement about preference of alternatives
11 at this time please stand up?

12 (All but three stand up.)

13 MS. TRIBE: It's well over two-thirds. So
14 I'm going to ask that the record reflect that. And I'm also
15 going to ask that you make a note that you revisit that
16 again in November.

17 (Lewis, White and Black did not stand up.)

18 MR. BAKER: On that second paragraph, again,
19 I would like to add, more or less, like a qualifier. It
20 should say "The Committee, after extensive review of all
21 alternatives, forwards to the National Park Service" --

22 MR. O'QUINN: We haven't reviewed all the
23 alternatives.

24 MS. TRIBE: So how about "After extensive
25 discussion about alternatives"?

1 MR. BAKER: It's got here "After extensive
2 and rich discussion," up top.

3 MS. LEWIS: Do you need any more, or are we
4 being redundant by inserting --

5 MR. BAKER: Probably. I was looking for some
6 other words that I can't find yet.

7 MR. DAKIN: We have extensively and enrichly
8 discussed studies. We have not even got to a real analysis
9 of the alternatives.

10 MS. TRIBE: Fred also wrote a statement for
11 the organization.

12 MR. BABB: It has to do with tying to the
13 agenda and what we did. So maybe the Committee doesn't like
14 it.

15 "The Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee met
16 on September 19th, 20th, 21st, 2001 at East Glacier Park
17 Lodge, East Glacier, Montana. Their task focused on four
18 objectives. The Committee's draft recommendations are
19 organized by objective. The studies prepared by Washington
20 Infrastructure and used by the Committee in drafting these
21 recommendations are found on the Glacier National Park's
22 website at" blank.

23 MS. STEWART: And you want that to go above
24 this page; is that right?

25 MR. BABB: I'm just saying I tried to write

1 that to tie what we have done and tie to the studies.
2 Because when they read this, nobody's going to understand
3 what this relates to.

4 MS. STEWART: We were supposed to include
5 just that first sentence, but that's fine with me.

6 MS. LEWIS: One of the things that we in your
7 pamphlet was our continued schedule that we're trying to
8 stay on with this process. On Monday, the 24th, we talked
9 about issuing a press release that captures this work and
10 this discussion, as well as getting it up on the website
11 when, Fred?

12 MR. BABB: Probably the following day.

13 MS. LEWIS: What's on your schedule? Do you
14 remember what's on your schedule?

15 Anyway, my concern is, given the extensiveness of
16 the changes that you've made in this draft document, which
17 is still a draft, going to be a draft for a long time, I'm
18 not sure we can do that on Monday without getting this back
19 out to you to look at. I mean, nobody has a clean copy of
20 what we will be releasing to the media on your behalf. And
21 so I'm concerned from the -- I don't want to create an
22 expectation, from the media standpoint or the Committee
23 member standpoint, without your endorsement. It would be
24 impossible for us to clean this document up and you review
25 it before press time on Monday.

1 MR. BABB: It is scheduled for the 24th, is
2 the way either reads.

3 MS. LEWIS: The website.

4 MS. TRIBE: So what she's suggesting is the
5 whole thing slips a week.

6 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't think we need a week.

7 MS. LEWIS: Well, what I am feeling is that
8 when we redraft this, it has to go back out to all of you to
9 read and all of you to give some sort of concurrence. And
10 we'd ask that if you're making extensive changes to the
11 draft, that you're going to have to copy your fellow
12 Committee members, so we have some way to get you a draft
13 again to look at.

14 I mean, I've taken some pretty good notes, they've
15 taken notes on the computer, and Bambi has the record. But
16 we have -- you have an obligation to go out to the media
17 with that we scheduled, thinking we could do it on Monday.
18 I'm just very concerned that we can meet that expectation in
19 a document that you're happy with, not seeing it again
20 before we do something on Monday.

21 MR. O'QUINN: You could issue a press release
22 Monday that's a summary but not complete details.

23 MS. TRIBE: That's a good idea.

24 MS. LEWIS: I guess, then, what I hear from
25 the Committee is that you are going to give us permission to

1 summarize for you.

2 MR. O'QUINN: You can say we met and we
3 discussed, and I think the press is going to be looking for
4 something from you.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah, they will.

6 MR. BLACK: Well, what Fred has in there is
7 that the recommendations came from the Committee. Now, all
8 of a sudden, we've got recommendations out there again.

9 MR. BABB: I just used your title that was in
10 the title.

11 MS. TRIBE: What I'd like to do is
12 acknowledge that the Park Service probably has to format it
13 and put some of those paragraphs in but not try to call for
14 any kind of agreement, because when he rewrote it, it was
15 before we had the discussion about whether we'd call them
16 recommendations and that kind of stuff. So here's my
17 biggest worry, as a facilitator. If you do not believe that
18 we have come to an agreement at this point, then I think the
19 best thing to do is to continue until we are in agreement.

20 Now, I know that you've got to see what's written
21 down and that kind of business. But for the most part, I
22 don't think that we're going to have things written down
23 that are totally different than you're saying. And so when
24 Suzann says we're going to send it all back and then it's
25 going to come back again, this could be an endless process

1 of wordsmithing. So I want to know what you think when you
2 get this document, what are you going to do with it? I
3 mean, they may be in for a three or four-week process of
4 going back and forth, back and forth. Barbara doesn't like
5 what Brian said.

6 MS. STEWART: We've agreed to all those
7 changes as we've gone through. And most of us have written
8 them down as we've gone through, and so I don't think it's
9 going to be a significant objection.

10 MS. LEWIS: That's what we need to hear.

11 MS. TRIBE: It would not be the place to
12 reopen your concerns that you didn't get your point made
13 here or that you didn't get -- the vote went against you.
14 It would not be the place to reopen it.

15 MR. JEWETT: You're right, it wouldn't be.
16 And that's why I wanted to take two or three minutes before
17 I left to say that -- I'm not going to say it now, because
18 it's not the time.

19 But I, frankly, think the process has been -- if
20 there has been a shortfall in this process, it has been in
21 the lack of opportunity for me to explore a multitude of
22 alternatives, other than what has been presented to us,
23 which I think has deeply short-changed what some of the
24 potential is for this road. And I am not satisfied with the
25 product for that reason.

1 That's where I'll leave that.

2 MS. TRIBE: So this is the first time in this
3 meeting that you've gotten to talk about alternatives at
4 all.

5 MR. JEWETT: You, yourself, said it. We have
6 worked for two years to get to a point where we can even
7 talk about alternatives. You said that at the beginning.
8 And the only alternative's talked about were the ones that
9 were presented to us in these documents. And I think there
10 is rich diversity of alternatives we could have explored,
11 given the information we have.

12 MS. TRIBE: And, Suzann, you wanted to
13 respond to that?

14 MS. LEWIS: No.

15 MR. BAKER: Back to this statement, would it
16 be possible, at the end of the third paragraph to add
17 another sentence saying The Committee will meet in November
18 to, somehow say, to review?

19 MS. TRIBE: Brian, I'm going to interrupt you
20 one minute.

21 Tony, are you leaving?

22 MR. JEWETT: I'm going to try to reschedule
23 my conference call so I can come back.

24 MR. BAKER: Just say "The Committee will meet
25 in November to review any changes or additions to these

1 alternatives and may come to a preferred alternative at that
2 time."

3 MS. STEWART: I don't think you should put
4 that in there.

5 MR. BAKER: Not even with the word "may"?

6 MS. TRIBE: Well, we could say "The Committee
7 will meet in November to review the public comments on the
8 Committee's discussion and finalize their recommendations to
9 the Park Service."

10 MR. BAKER: And "may narrow their
11 recommendations"?

12 MS. TRIBE: I think you're out of luck here.

13 MR. DAKIN: I'd like to state that I'm
14 prepared to be comfortable with what's here, with the
15 necessary insertion by the Park Service to make its format
16 correspond with the requirements of the Charter.

17 I'm curious what -- why -- is it not possible to
18 just stay here and allow some time for the wordsmithing to
19 be done and reconvene in an hour and a half or something and
20 finish this up, as opposed to losing a whole week? Because
21 the Inter Lake was here, the Hungry Horse News is here.
22 It's going to be in the press, whether we have a press
23 release available or not.

24 When I came here, I thought that this whole day
25 might well be used up. And I don't have a big deal with

1 having to stay late, as long as we could retain it for them.

2 MS. STEWART: Do we all agree that the latter
3 pages are all okay, the ones that we just spent the morning
4 going through making changes? We all agreed to those, did
5 we not?

6 MS. TRIBE: Do you have any problem with us
7 just sort of saying we finished on the visitor development
8 strategies? Do you have to review that again?

9 MR. DAKIN: No.

10 MS. STEWART: And I think if the girls could,
11 right now, add the portions that Fred just put together,
12 that takes care of that section. And we should be able to
13 do that quickly.

14 MS. TRIBE: They told me they have five
15 areas, little things, we need to talk about and to Bambi,
16 and they can be finished. They can probably print this out
17 in 15 minutes.

18 So in 30 minutes we could print it out and have a
19 look.

20 Now, there may be people in the room that have a
21 flight to catch. Is there anybody that could not stay until
22 1:30?

23 MR. O'QUINN: I think we could stay here
24 until nine o'clock tonight and wordsmith it to death. I
25 think they have and you have the gist of what we wanted, and

1 get it in a readable form and then get it out to us. And if
2 we've got a real serious problem, come back. But to sit
3 here and argue about whether to use "a" or "an" from now
4 until nine o'clock tonight is -- I don't think is getting
5 anywhere.

6 MS. TRIBE: Barney, what I'm trying to do is
7 see if we might leave the room saying Amen.

8 MR. O'QUINN: I'm good to go.

9 MS. TRIBE: How many people in this room on
10 the Committee would be willing to, say, based on our
11 discussion today, I don't have to see it again, I'm good to
12 go; stand up.

13 (Nine stand up.)

14 MS. TRIBE: So maybe the people who aren't
15 good to go could stay to see the final document.

16 Are you willing to stay 'til 1:00?

17 MS. PAHL: Yes.

18 MR. O'QUINN: Let's stay until 1:00.

19 MS. TRIBE: I'm yours 'til midnight, but I'm
20 proposing, while we do this, we go ahead with the November
21 agenda, we get a look at it one last time and we go home,
22 and then you don't have the business of back and forth and
23 all of that.

24 MS. ANDERSON: I was just going to say I
25 think it's better if we all have had the opportunity to look

1 at it so that nobody can ever say Well, I never really saw
2 the final letter that was going out. It seems like we're
3 covering our tails to make sure that we -- and I agree with
4 Barney, we do not need to sit here until ten o'clock and
5 wordsmith it, but I think we should just make sure we agree
6 with the wordsmith of it.

7 MS. TRIBE: Here's an important thing I like
8 to use. What's the worst thing that will happen if it stays
9 that way? So if you apply that and you don't need to change
10 it, remember it's a draft and it's going to be commented on.
11 We're going to look at it again.

12 MR. JACKSON: Is it time for me to make that
13 all right with everyone?

14 Jean and I agree that there's probably an error in
15 the estimated dollar losses from different road alternatives
16 on the tourism industry. I would ask -- and it could be
17 substantial, we don't know how big it is.

18 I would ask that she prepare an errata sheet to be
19 included in this report. Because I'm afraid to death those
20 numbers will be -- that area will be forgotten, and it will
21 go right into the EIS and it will live for a long time. And
22 I think that it wouldn't be hard to do, and I think it would
23 be a good idea. That's the sentiment of the Committee it
24 would be well done.

25 MS. TOWNSEND: Dave did point out something

1 to me about 90 seconds before I made my presentation and,
2 indeed, there might be a mistake. And it relates to the
3 definition of visitor versus visitation.

4 What is true, or what we both believe is true, is
5 the percentage reductions in visitor activity from the three
6 alternatives. What might need looking at is the dollar
7 amount that that represents. And so if you remember -- let
8 me see if I can remember. Alternative 3 was a 14-percent
9 reduction, Alternative 4 was a 17-percent reduction,
10 Alternative 5, I think, was a 25-percent reduction. We
11 believe that those percentage reductions are valid, however,
12 the magnitude may, indeed, need to be re-examined, the
13 magnitude in dollars. So the dollars may be -- and you each
14 have a sheet in there. So the percentages are likely right,
15 the dollars may be wrong, meaning they're too high.

16 And Dave asked me -- I don't have my stuff to look
17 at it. So Dave asked me to look it when I go back. So
18 that's what's up. The dollar volumes may be too high, they
19 may be exaggerated. And, indeed, if they are, I
20 think -- Dave and I both have a concern that those dollar
21 numbers get out and about.

22 MR. JACKSON: Right.

23 MS. TOWNSEND: So at sometime an adjustment
24 to these figures is appropriate. What I'm trying to say is
25 that by the time you have this public release, you don't

1 want to wait until we redo these calculations. So I don't
2 know how you might want to deal with that.

3 MS. LEWIS: I was going to suggest that you
4 have your correction prepared by the next Committee meeting,
5 at the latest and, if you can, do it earlier.

6 MS. TOWNSEND: It will be way earlier than
7 that. It just don't be done by Monday.

8 MS. TRIBE: So we're agreeing, then, that
9 this will not be part of the mailing that goes out from the
10 Committees results and that we hope to have those things by
11 the November 15th meeting.

12 Okay; Dave, thank you. Jean, thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Along that same line, during
14 our discussions this week, it was pointed out that the cost
15 estimatore for the alternatives include only road work and
16 nothing else. And so I think it might be helpful if those
17 cost estimates are expanded upon to include whatever
18 additional things need to be put in the cost estimates, to
19 make them comprehensive. Because of the concern we talked
20 about earlier of not understating this number to the public
21 and then having that become a problem later. So I don't
22 know what possibilities there are for that, but I think if
23 we could have that by the next meeting, that would be
24 helpful.

25 MR. O'QUINN: What's that?

1 MR. KRACUM: Our underlying is as she just
2 pointed out yesterday, when you have a 50-year period of
3 time, even putting in any percentages, makes it out of line.

4 MS. TRIBE: So are we settled on that?

5 Now, could we move very quickly and, Tony, we've
6 agreed to stay 'til one o'clock. But I don't think that we
7 probably will open up again the discussion about additional
8 alternatives.

9 So you wanted to -- you sort of had to run out.
10 Did you want to say anything else about that? What are you
11 proposing? What should we do? I know you're disappointed.
12 What should we do?

13 MR. JEWETT: Well, I'm not going to propose
14 another alternative, you know. But what I did want to say
15 was that we have done really good work. People have worked
16 really hard in all segments of this discussion, whether it's
17 the consultants, the Park Service, the Committee, and it's
18 hard work. It's slow, sludgy work to get through this
19 stuff. It's been fits and starts. And I think we're just
20 now at a point where we have enough information in front of
21 us to begin to be creative around some of the things we've
22 identified that we have in common.

23 The first thing we identified that we had in
24 common is that the road is a world class experience and we
25 ought to try to optimize that. And I think we have

1 information to be able to stimulate a public dialogue around
2 that that, in my view, we haven't adopted the kinds of
3 alternatives or had the opportunity for discussion to put
4 that smorgasbord out front. And that's a disappointment to
5 me, because I think -- and I'll give you one example, and
6 then I'll sit down.

7 Half the people who were surveyed said they would
8 take a shuttle bus to see the road. 46 percent said they'd
9 do that. There are federal dollars available to build
10 shuttle systems when you have construction projects. 10,000
11 people travel that road at peak season. A maximum shuttle
12 system would carry 30 percent of those. That's a 30-percent
13 reduction in cars. It has been identified by the engineers
14 that even a 10-percent reduction in vehicular traffic would
15 result in considerable savings. So if we picked the optimum
16 shuttle time, applied for federal funds to buy it and listed
17 that as an alternative, we could, potentially, have an
18 alternative that was considerable savings and a faster time
19 schedule.

20 One example of information we just got that we
21 couldn't process. And I think it's important to recognize
22 that, frankly.

23 MS. TRIBE: So in Alternative B, one of the
24 things we have in here is "Explore the feasibility of
25 utilizing shuttle systems."

1 MR. JEWETT: I'm not -- I don't want to open
2 this up to debate; okay? I just want to say that I think
3 that it's too bad we didn't have the opportunity to be as
4 good as we could be.

5 MS. TRIBE: Okay. You would have liked to
6 have fuller discussion, richer discussion, and maybe rather
7 than just as a part of an alternative, looking at it as sort
8 of a framework for an alternative.

9 MR. JEWETT: I think we were provided
10 frameworks of alternatives to discuss but weren't provided
11 the opportunities to discuss those.

12 MS. TRIBE: And so yesterday, when part of
13 the task list was to identify other alternatives to
14 consider, the ones that came forward -- the only additional
15 one, really, had to do with the looping business.

16 MR. JEWETT: I don't want to get into details
17 on this, because I think that it has been hard work, we've
18 moved forward, and I think where we're at -- but I really
19 needed to say that.

20 MS. TRIBE: I appreciate it. And what I'm
21 trying to do is say that I don't think it's totally off the
22 table. I think it's building to one of the alternatives. I
23 think you have the opportunity for the public to remark on
24 it. Exploring the feasibility has to bring some of that
25 information forward, and I think that takes us right to the

1 business of agenda items for the November 15th meeting.

2 What are you going to do there?

3 MR. DAKIN: I think that we're doing this,
4 thinking that Mary's fixing our paperwork so that at one
5 o'clock we can revise it. But she can't because Bambi's too
6 busy. If we don't shut up for a few minutes and let Bambi
7 talk to Mary, we're going to be here at one o'clock and
8 we're not going to have anything to look at. Can we just be
9 quiet for a few minutes before we get to the agenda items?

10 MR. O'QUINN: Before we do, I don't think
11 this needs to be recorded. Fred was going to talk about the
12 agenda for November.

13 MS. LEWIS: Everything has to be of record
14 when we're on session.

15 MS. TRIBE: I'm going to see if we can get
16 this done in about 15 minutes. So imagine your break at 15
17 minutes, but we might call you back later; okay?

18 (Proceedings in recess from 12:20 p.m. to
19 12:35 p.m.)

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: What are agenda items for our
21 November meeting?

22 We have to review our public comment and finalize
23 our advice to the Park Service.

24 MR. BAKER: This is the schedule
25 that -- basically, your last three points might help.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, this is the schedule
2 for November 15th. Is November 15th a good date for
3 everybody? Anybody that can't make it on November 15th?

4 MR. JACKSON: Could I suggest, between the
5 review of comments and the finalized report, is to have a
6 statement of findings? And that would be where we could, in
7 fact, talk about some of the kinds of nature of what we've
8 learned, recognizing that we don't have the complete
9 alternatives or anything silly like that, but we can still
10 talk about what we learned from the Washington group and
11 what we learned from discussion of alternatives and the
12 ability to kind of rehash and for the Park Service to create
13 some alternatives and to create some kind of stuff with
14 that. I think we could have a set of findings which would
15 lead, then, to our recommendation.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: You're thinking about this
17 being something in writing?

18 MR. JACKSON: We could do it in the way that
19 we've done here, and maybe agree to limit it so it isn't
20 some huge mess but just some general things that I think
21 would put a tone on this that would help some of the folks
22 that have some pretty strong constituencies and,
23 simultaneously, keep us out of the mirky waters of a
24 preferred alternative before an EIS.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any thoughts from other

1 members on Dave's suggestion?

2 MR. BAKER: Is what you're saying is you
3 would -- you think it might be appropriate for us to have
4 sort of like a closing statement?

5 MR. JACKSON: Yes.

6 It would allow, for instance, us to describe and
7 discuss what we've seen emerge, just as ideas in those two
8 alternatives that are kind of boxed out that we see all the
9 creativity.

10 MR. DAKIN: Can we not do that in that final
11 meeting prior to? I mean, can we have like an
12 hour-and-a-half session of saying Here are our final -- our
13 members' final comments?

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's what I'm just
15 wondering. I think a lot of what you're talking about will
16 be in the written documents. I'm not sure how that would
17 deviate from it. But secondly, I would think there would be
18 time for people to summarize their thoughts from the meeting
19 and be done, verbally. What do the rest of you think?

20 Opportunity to what, to discuss your thoughts,
21 David, at the meeting; is that kind of what you're thinking?

22 MR. JACKSON: Well, I think there's a variety
23 of things that we agree on, in great principle, which we're
24 in a box on when it comes to we're supposed to recommend
25 some recommended alternatives for the EIS process. Well, of

1 course, how we get to those recommended alternatives is what
2 this two-year process has been about. So I mean, it seems
3 to me that a statement of findings would be a preamble to
4 our recommendations. And in that statement of findings we
5 can talk about a number of -- a number of issues that a lot
6 of us can agree on, then we can run around saying Here are
7 the alternatives.

8 Maybe we don't have to with this, but it seems
9 that's a way of kind of ending up.

10 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any thoughts or reaction to
11 Dave's suggestion from anybody on the Committee?

12 MS. PAHL: I guess I'd rather wait and act on
13 that at the meeting and see what the public comments are
14 like. We haven't looked at this yet.

15 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Were you finished, Dave?

16 So we need to review what public comment comes in
17 between now and the final meeting, and then we need to
18 finalize our report to the Park Service.

19 Anything else we need to accomplish at that
20 meeting?

21 MS. MOE: I think we should review the new
22 data that Jean comes up with.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Sure. And also the
24 additional cost estimates from Joe.

25 Anything else? That's all I can think of we need

1 to accomplish at the final meeting. Anything else we need
2 to do?

3 We need to, I guess, be prepared to issue a final
4 press release at that -- after that meeting and then get our
5 report on the website, which I think goes without saying.

6 MR. DAKIN: The other thing I think I need to
7 know is where it's going to be, if that's been decided.

8 MS. LEWIS: I think we pretty much decided
9 we'll go back to the west side, and we'll probably go right
10 back downtown where we had the first meeting, if we can get
11 space available there. So it will probably be at the West
12 Coast Hotel downtown, as long as we can make those
13 arrangements.

14 MS. TOWNSEND: Are you going to have public
15 comment during your meeting at any time?

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Any thoughts?

17 MR. DAKIN: It's hard to say no. I mean, I
18 think we should say -- we didn't get much this meeting, but
19 it would be nice to schedule some time.

20 MS. LEWIS: I think it would be consistent in
21 the manner in which the Committee has always conducted its
22 comment.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Right. Well, we've had
24 public comment on every meeting. It seems to me we should
25 have a public comment period during the meeting and consider

1 that as well.

2 MS. TRIBE: And you're more likely to hear
3 comments, because these are people who will have reacted to
4 your advice and may have things to say about it.

5 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Then it seems to me, in terms
6 of the agenda for the meeting, we should have the public
7 comment period earlier in the day so that we can take that
8 into consideration in doing our final report.

9 Are there other questions or considerations or
10 thoughts that we should have on the agenda?

11 MS. TRIBE: This is a full-day meeting?

12 CHAIRMAN OGLE: We will start at what, 9:00
13 in the morning, 8:00 in the morning? I say we may as well
14 start first thing in the morning and take as long as it
15 takes.

16 MS. LEWIS: The only thing that would
17 preclude you from adjourning early and finishing your work
18 is if you scheduled public comments later in the day. But
19 you've put in there you want it early in the day. It may be
20 that you want to begin at 8:30 and maybe have a half an hour
21 of getting together and then open your public comment from
22 9:00 to 10:00, and then that would leave you two hours to
23 deliberate, a lunch break, and you'd see if you still have
24 more work to be done and then you have the afternoon.

25 MR. DAKIN: Very good.

1 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Maybe in our first opening
2 session we can hear from Jean and Joe on what additional
3 information they may have come up with and then have the
4 public comment and then go forward.

5 MS. TOWNSEND: I don't think we're scheduled
6 to be here.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Well, then we'll review your
8 information.

9 MS. TRIBE: Randy, maybe a little affective
10 exercise.

11 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I was trying to ignore you.

12 MS. TRIBE: I could tell that. I'm hard to
13 ignore.

14 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Anything anybody else can
15 think of that should be on the agenda? I think we have an
16 agenda for our last meeting. So we have our revised advice
17 here.

18 MS. TRIBE: And as Randy just said, if we
19 need it, you're willing to work as long as it takes.

20 MS. PAHL: I'm going to need a little
21 parameter. For as long as it takes to deal -- if it's just
22 going to take a day, that's easy.

23 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I can't imagine us going more
24 than a day. My thought was we might get done earlier in the
25 day, but I couldn't imagine going more than a day. Can

1 anyone else? Primarily, what we're going to be doing is
2 listening to public comment, listening to the information
3 that we receive between now and then, and finalizing this
4 report. So I wouldn't think it would be more than one day.

5 MS. TRIBE: So it might be useful if people
6 were going to fly, they fly after dinner.

7 MS. PAHL: No, I don't have that choice;
8 6:05.

9 MS. TRIBE: So people would be willing to
10 work at least 'til 5:00, if you needed it; okay? How's
11 that?

12 MS. ANDERSON: That may not be enough time.

13 MS. PAHL: The Committee does not need to
14 worry about it.

15 MR. BAKER: I think, for those of us that
16 either need to fly or drive from a distance, it's a two
17 nighter anyway.

18 MS. TRIBE: Well, we have a couple things to
19 do to finalize this.

20 MS. LEWIS: We need to read one thing into
21 the record for Bambi.

22 I think the record needs to reflect that there is
23 a quorum present, that the following members have left;
24 Lowell, Susie, Barney, Jayne, and Tony. We have 12 members
25 present. We only need 10 for a quorum.

1 MS. TRIBE: And I'm not sure if this is legal
2 or not, but both Barney and Lowell said to me I'm good to go
3 on whatever it is, I'll support.

4 Well, I'd like to give you just a couple of
5 minutes. And by "support," I mean, they're okay with how
6 it's written.

7 I'd like to give you a couple of minutes to look
8 at this. What we need to look at is on page one, the
9 introductory paragraph that's sort of qualifying things. We
10 are pretty sure it's exactly what you said. And it's absent
11 the things that Brian kind of tried to slip in at the end
12 but we wouldn't let him.

13 And then if you would please look at Alternative
14 C, which is on page three, we need to do whatever we need to
15 do on it. And what I want you to do is, verbatim, take
16 notes on your paper so that we have agreement on what those
17 things are. And then I had a couple of people circle some
18 things for me that they were going to take to the common
19 elements, and I want to make sure we accommodated those. We
20 also moved the elements common to all alternatives to the
21 front so that it starts out by saying "The Committee
22 recommends that the following elements be included in every
23 alternative:" and then we followed that with the alternative
24 discussion.

25 (Whereupon the Committee members of 12 reviewed

1 the reprinted draft advice.)

2 MS. TRIBE: Are there any comments on the
3 front page? You'll notice by the red thing on there we
4 already had one screw up.

5 Anna Marie.

6 MS. MOE: On the second paragraph, it says
7 "The Going-to-the-Sun Road Advisory Committee Charter
8 states," and I think we should put the rest of that
9 paragraph in quotes and as a direct quote from the Charter.

10 MS. TRIBE: Where should the first quotation
11 mark be?

12 MS. MOE: Before "The.

13 MS. TRIBE: And go all the way to decision."

14 MS. MOE: Right.

15 MR. BAKER: In the first three paragraphs of
16 that, the first paragraph is okay, because they discuss
17 alternatives. The second and third one, we're back to
18 options. I think we should maybe make it say "alternatives"
19 instead of "options."

20 MS. TRIBE: "...the following modified
21 alternatives...."

22 MR. BAKER: Keep it consistent.

23 MS. TRIBE: And it's in the fourth one as
24 well. "...the Committee feels these alternatives...." And
25 if you wanted to soften "alternatives" you could say

1 "alternative approaches."

2 So what we're agreeing to do here, and I wanted
3 you to make a note, is any place it says "options" in the
4 first four paragraphs, we will replace with "alternatives";
5 all right?

6 MS. LEWIS: I have one that follows right
7 after the last change that would occur from the word
8 "options" to "alternatives."

9 If you continue with that sentence, "...the
10 Committee feels these alternatives need to move forward to
11 provide a wide range of considerations to be fully analyzed
12 by the National Park Service for inclusion into the
13 environmental process." I'd like to suggest that it's
14 actually "considerations to be fully analyzed by the
15 National Park Service and the public in the environmental
16 process." The public is our partner in environmental
17 analysis.

18 MS. TRIBE: "...and the public in the
19 environmental process." Is that okay?

20 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Yeah.

21 MS. PAHL: Yeah.

22 MR. JACKSON: Shouldn't it be the NEPA
23 process?

24 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think it's the same thing,
25 isn't it.

1 MR. JACKSON: You can have an environmental
2 process without the NEPA.

3 MS. TRIBE: Why don't we just say it for what
4 it is; the Environmental Impact Statement.

5 MS. MOE: I was just going to say the
6 environmental process in there was because, again, that
7 relates directly to the target in the Charter.

8 MS. TRIBE: So we'll go back to Charter
9 language; okay.

10 I want to apologize to Linda. Jean caught it. We
11 missed a comment under Elements Common To All Alternatives,
12 fourth one down, "Traffic management strategies that include
13 flaggers and flaggers skilled in communication."

14 Any other comments on page one?

15 Let's go to page two.

16 MS. MOE: On the last option down, at the
17 bottom of the page, "...four hour closure strategy and
18 rationale." You need an E on so it's not rational.

19 MS. TRIBE: "Rational" needs an E on the end
20 of it.

21 MR. DAKIN: Page two, the third and fourth
22 bullets from the bottom of the page say the same thing.

23 MS. TRIBE: Next, "Explore the feasibility of
24 using shuttle systems," and then we said it again.

25 Brian.

1 MR. BAKER: I need a clarification.
2 Throughout the A, B and C alternatives, you have used the
3 word "major." I would like to know where the minor ones
4 are. If there are no minors, I would like to eliminate the
5 use of the word "major."

6 MS. TRIBE: As I said, those were just my
7 words from old NEPA days.

8 MS. LEWIS: If you begin on A on page two,
9 it's in the first line of the first bullet. It is also in
10 the first bullet of B, and C.

11 MS. TRIBE: So simply say "Include priority
12 rehabilitation as an alternative...."

13 Anything on page three?

14 MS. LEWIS: On item C, second bullet from the
15 bottom, "Explore the costs and benefits of a full or halfway
16 closure during shoulder seasons." My notes indicate from
17 our discussion that was to be deleted.

18 MS. TRIBE: Okay.

19 MS. LEWIS: Second bullet from the bottom
20 under C, my notes from this morning say it was to be
21 deleted.

22 MS. TRIBE: That we would not have.

23 MR. BLACK: We were saying it was already in
24 there.

25 And then the next bullet.

1 MR. DAKIN: In the same place there, the last
2 bullet under C and the third-from-the-last bullet under C,
3 I'm unable to distinguish between them. Where you explore
4 the costs and benefits of closing one side at a time. It
5 seems that that does incorporate whatever's intended in the
6 last bullet.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I thought we were going to
8 delete the last bullet, is what my notes were.

9 MR. DAKIN: We were at least going to delete
10 "west side" because it has to go both ways. But I think
11 it's the same as the one -- two above it.

12 MS. TRIBE: What happened here is we went to
13 that front qualifying paragraph and, basically, we stopped
14 on C. So we did not have agreement, I think, on a lot of
15 these.

16 So Roscoe, would you?

17 MR. BLACK: Right. On the final bullet point
18 there, it was my recommendation that we look at the costs
19 and benefits of when we have segment closure that we have
20 managed traffic on the other side that doesn't have the
21 segment closure so that we can get two things going at the
22 same time.

23 MR. TRIBE: Can you help with the language
24 here? Explore the costs and benefits of --

25 MR. BLACK: Including traffic management and

1 rehabilitation on the side of Logan Pass that does not have
2 the segment closure.

3 MS. TRIBE: Could I ask you, and maybe
4 everyone else is clear, but why you included rehabilitation?

5 MR. DAKIN: I understand what you're
6 clarifying there.

7 MS. PAHL: I do, but can we maybe say it
8 clearer, because it's confusing.

9 MR. BLACK: Maybe we need to talk about the
10 limited traffic stoppage. Basically, what we were talking
11 about is having segment closure and you can still do spot
12 projects that had the alternating one way on the other side.

13 MR. DAKIN: Right.

14 MS. TRIBE: So "Include traffic
15 management" -- I'm going to not put "rehabilitation" in
16 there. "Include traffic management on the side of Logan
17 Pass that does not have the segment closure." What else
18 needs to be there?

19 MR. DAKIN: Maybe it would help if we did
20 explore the costs and benefits of one-side closure with
21 ongoing rehabilitation and traffic management on the
22 unclosed side.

23 MS. PAHL: Are you basically wanting to make
24 sure that you're only closing one side at a time, a piece of
25 one side?

1 MR. BLACK: What I'm saying is, look at the
2 cost benefits of closing a segment, let's say, on the east
3 side, but you wouldn't just leave the west side completely
4 open during that whole period of time. You could still be
5 doing management and doing other projects on that side.

6 MR. KRACUM: We get it for what it's worth.

7 MS. LEWIS: Could we leave the third bullet
8 up?

9 MS. TRIBE: Because as Bill said --

10 MS. ANSOTEGUI: I thought we were deleting
11 the second bullet up.

12 MS. LEWIS: But it's also been suggested that
13 the third bullet, the "Explore the costs and benefits of
14 closing one side at a time" is the same.

15 MR. DAKIN: Now that I better understand the
16 bottom bullet, I don't believe that that's true, Suzann.
17 They're really different concepts there. Closing one side
18 at a time, we meant closing one side at a time for extended
19 lengths of time.

20 MS. TRIBE: Before we make that decision,
21 could we make sure we have the language for them on the last
22 one?

23 MR. DAKIN: "Explore the costs and benefits
24 of one-side closure with ongoing rehabilitation and traffic
25 management on the unclosed side."

1 MR. BLACK: But I think we were talking about
2 segment closure there, as opposed to one-side closure.

3 MR. DAKIN: Whereas the third bullet up talks
4 about closing the whole side.

5 MS. LEWIS: One side is referring that the
6 point is Logan Pass, one side of Logan Pass.

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: Do you want to leave in the
8 third bullet from the bottom?

9 MR. DAKIN: I think so.

10 MS. TRIBE: Let's just see if we can close
11 this one first.

12 MS. ANSOTEGUI: "Explore the costs and
13 benefits of one-side closure with ongoing rehabilitation and
14 traffic management on the unclosed side of Logan Pass."

15 MS. PAHL: I think the public is not going to
16 guess that. I think it's still awkward as a sentence.

17 MS. TRIBE: So could you say when closing a
18 segment on one side of the pass, assure that traffic
19 management and rehabilitation projects can continue on the
20 other side?

21 MR. BLACK: But we're looking for them to
22 explore the costs and benefits of doing it that way.

23 MS. LEWIS: That's the action we're asking to
24 be taken.

25 MS. TRIBE: Explore the costs and benefits of

1 when a segment closure occurs on one-side, traffic
2 management and rehabilitation can be occurring on the other
3 side.

4 MR. BLACK: Exactly.

5 MS. TRIBE: And we need to clean up the when.

6 MR. DAKIN: But just so I have my draft
7 properly altered, we did agree to delete the
8 next-to-the-last bullet in the section.

9 MS. TRIBE: Right.

10 MS. ANSOTEGUI: "...of full or halfway closer
11 during the shoulder season" is out.

12 MS. TRIBE: Would you read the one you just
13 typed that's poorly --

14 MS. ANSOTEGUI: "Explore the costs and
15 benefits of when a segment closure occurs on one side and
16 traffic management on the other side."

17 MS. TRIBE: I'm going to say it again, and
18 the "when" is really awkward. "Explore the costs and
19 benefits of when a segment closure occurs on one side of the
20 pass, traffic management and rehabilitation could occur on
21 the other side of Logan Pass."

22 Then if Mary's finished, then if we could go to
23 the third bullet up, "Explore the costs and benefits of
24 closing one side at a time." Is that a keeper? Because
25 it's significantly different or not.

1 MS. ANDERSON: It is, and it should say "one
2 side of Logan Pass."

3 MS. TRIBE: We're keeping the third bullet
4 from the bottom, and we are inserting "of closing one side
5 of Logan Pass at a time"; all right?

6 You can see that there should be i-n-g on each one
7 of these action words. We just didn't make it consistent
8 with the other two, but we will.

9 At the top in the first sentence, we didn't rename
10 the alternative in the sentence. So we would say include
11 the Accelerated Completion Through Isolated Road Segment
12 Suspensions or (Closures) as an alternative. We'll just
13 rename it there.

14 Anything else?

15 Bill, did you have something you were keeping for
16 me a circled thing?

17 Brian, did you have a circled thing?

18 MS. MOE: I had "Utilizing current, real-time
19 visitor use data and adjusting traffic management hours so
20 that most delays are in the lowest traffic/use period."

21 MS. TRIBE: And you were suggesting?

22 MS. MOE: That had originally been under B.

23 MS. TRIBE: And you thought it should be
24 under Common Elements.

25 MS. MOE: Well, yeah. But you told me to say

1 to put it under C.

2 MS. TRIBE: Well, what do I know? Would you
3 read it again?

4 MS. MOE: "Utilizing current, real-time
5 visitor use data and adjusting traffic management hours so
6 that most delays are in the lowest traffic/use period."

7 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That should go up under
8 Common Elements. Put that up in Common Elements.

9 MS. TOWNSEND: All you're talking about is
10 moving it upwards.

11 MS. TRIBE: So we have a copy of the
12 statement through Bambi's notes and Mary. And all we need
13 to do is --

14 MR. BAKER: I'm sorry, I didn't tell the
15 truth. I did have a circled item that you told me to read
16 from.

17 It was in regards to the work to increase funding
18 for maintenance costs to prevent further deterioration.
19 That was to be included in common elements.

20 MS. LEWIS: Where is it?

21 MR. BAKER: It was under Priority
22 Rehabilitation. It says "Improve this alternative by:"

23 MS. TRIBE: It's the thing that we got stuck
24 on the funds and what you're saying in all Common Elements
25 is actually something that doesn't necessarily go in

1 alternatives. What you're saying here is, assure that
2 there's a permanent fund for maintenance and operation.

3 MR. BAKER: Well, no. What we wanted to say,
4 from what I gather from my notes, is what we wanted to say
5 is as a common element, that we wanted to work to increase
6 funding for maintenance costs to prevent further
7 deterioration of the road.

8 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I think I'd move to apply
9 that to Common Elements.

10 MS. TRIBE: Does work to move to --

11 MR. BAKER: Or encourage further funding or
12 increased funding.

13 MS. LEWIS: As a common element, he would
14 analyze what that would add to the cost of the alternative.

15 MR. BAKER: Okay.

16 MS. TRIBE: So it would be identify and
17 analyze.

18 MR. BLACK: It seemed to me, because I had it
19 circled on mine too, that we were looking to front-load this
20 as part of each of the alternatives.

21 MR. BAKER: I had a questionmark by that, but
22 you're right. We wanted to get that road front-load.

23 MS. LEWIS: To add those front-load costs.

24 MR. BLACK: Exactly.

25 MS. TRIBE: And you said in the discussion,

1 why wouldn't we want those in all of them.

2 MR. BLACK: Exactly.

3 MS. TRIBE: And I think we had two different
4 comments in the original thing.

5 So does this do it for us, if we move to the
6 Common Elements, "Front-loading maintenance" -- or
7 "Front-load maintenance costs to prevent further
8 deterioration." That goes in every alternative and it comes
9 out of A.

10 Anna Marie.

11 MS. MOE: I don't know if we need something,
12 I guess, under A, specifically, just because it's such a
13 much longer time period than the other alternatives you're
14 looking at, was the reason that I thought we had kept that
15 in Alternative A, because we're looking at 20 years of
16 possible deterioration instead of --

17 MS. TRIBE: But this doesn't mean it wouldn't
18 be in A. It means it would be in B and C.

19 MS. MOE: Yeah.

20 MR. BAKER: She just tweaks -- maybe it needs
21 to be emphasized in A, though, because of that. That's what
22 you're saying, isn't it?

23 MS. MOE: Right.

24 MS. TRIBE: This is one of those places where
25 what will it hurt if it's in or out? Does it matter? If

1 it's put in and it's redundant, so what? If it's out, it
2 will be caught in the Common Elements. So all you have to
3 decide is if you want it in there for Common Elements.

4 MR. DAKIN: Yes, leave it in A.

5 MS. TRIBE: Front-loading based on Anna
6 Marie's acknowledgment that we're talking about a 20-year.
7 It stays there and it also goes into Common Element.

8 I want to make sure that the other one you talked
9 about a minute ago, Brian, which is the one that came off of
10 here and moved to Common Element, that's the one about
11 identify and analyze, or is this the same thing?

12 MR. BAKER: It's the same thing.

13 MS. TRIBE: Is there anything else?

14 Did you have a circled one you were keeping?
15 Linda, did you have anything? Dave, Joni, Don, you weren't
16 keeping one for me? Suzann? Randy?

17 This is really scary. I think we might be done.

18 You know, like I said, was it three weeks ago we
19 started this meeting? I do this work nearly every day of my
20 life, and there aren't very many people who would be willing
21 to do the amount of work that you did in one day yesterday,
22 and the amount of work that Bambi and Mary and Dayna did
23 last night in support of you. And I want to give them a big
24 hand.

25 (Applause.)

1 MS. TRIBE: We were a little crabby
2 but -- actually, we're crabbier today.

3 Barbara, would you do the benediction please?

4 MS. PAHL: Well, I would like to say that I
5 did a lot of facilitating, but I would never do what you did
6 yesterday. And I would never do what you did 'til midnight.
7 So I want to give you a big hand.

8 MS. TRIBE: Thank you. I'd like to say I do
9 it for money.

10 MR. DAKIN: We're not going any farther here,
11 but before we all kiss and go away, something got lost on
12 page four B, Guard walls, third section. Advice Related to
13 Operations and Maintenance. We did insert a sentence, but
14 the sentence that got printed here isn't the sentence that
15 we inserted.

16 MS. TRIBE: And that's the one place that we
17 were going to have Bambi do it and we decided we wouldn't,
18 so would you change the sentence for us?

19 MR. DAKIN: Are you with me on location?
20 Page four.

21 Under Advice Related to Operations and Maintenance
22 was to read "Write and implement a manual of maintenance
23 procedures, especially for snow plowing, which includes
24 seasonal and annual inspection and evaluation of
25 maintenance-related facility impacts."

1 MS. TRIBE: Thank you, Bill, very much.

2 MR. DAKIN: Now we can kiss and hug, because
3 I didn't see anything else.

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I would just like to say, in
5 addition to thanking Virginia for her help, I don't think we
6 could have gotten through the meeting without her
7 assistance. I wish she'd have been here earlier. Thank you
8 very much.

9 And thanks to Dayna and Mary for all of their
10 efforts, but also, I'd like to thank Joe and his staff. You
11 folks might remember that we were -- we've seen a different
12 group from Washington Infrastructure at every meeting, and
13 we've had a lot of missed deadlines. And Joe came on board
14 this spring and had to pick up the ball and try to bring
15 this thing together for this meeting. And I think, coming
16 in where they did and getting these manuals out and getting
17 us through this meeting at the place where they came in, I
18 think they did a yeoman's job, and I appreciate it.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. KRACUM: Thank you. And once again, it's
21 the guys that worked on it that made it happen for us.

22 MS. TRIBE: While we're thanking, let's thank
23 all those National Park people who did not get work done at
24 home because they were here in case, and needed to being
25 here in case, as well as the limited number of public that

1 we had. And, you know, Debbie sat back there and guarded
2 the door the whole time.

3 (Applause.)

4 MS. TRIBE: The kissing and hugging that I
5 like best is to say, first of all, you are good to go on
6 this draft being signed by Randy and distributed.

7 (All say yes.)

8 MS. TRIBE: Anybody who is not in favor of
9 that, stand up.

10 I'm going to declare that hundred percent
11 consensus out of an exaggerated quorum.

12 I'd like one person, and I think it would be
13 useful if you started, Bill, if you didn't mind. Would you
14 turn to the person on your left over there and, in no longer
15 than 20 seconds or so, tell Brian what you appreciated most
16 about his contribution here. We're going to go right
17 around. Last person will be Randy to Bill. And then as the
18 Chair, and Suzann as the designated federal official, if
19 either of you have any closing remarks, go ahead and make
20 them and we'll be on the road.

21 MR. DAKIN: Was that a go?

22 You're ability to bring away different perspective
23 to the issues and your courage to state them. I really
24 appreciate it.

25 MR. BAKER: Ditto.

1 Tom, you make me think about different things that
2 I would never have thought about, and your perspective on
3 recreational planning and land use was amazing. Thank you.

4 MR. MCDONALD: Anna Marie, I really
5 appreciate your taking the extra step and volunteering to do
6 other duties that I wouldn't have wanted to do. So I really
7 appreciate that.

8 MS. MOE: Roscoe, I appreciated the
9 contribution you brought to making sure that the east side
10 businesses and the Blackfeet Nation were taken into
11 consideration, and to help bring the perspective of the
12 traffic patterns that may not have been fully cashed in and
13 the data that you bring.

14 MR. BLACK: Thank you.

15 I appreciate you not hitting me with any of the
16 darts that you shot at Barney but actually kept me on my
17 toes. I didn't know what was going to happen back and
18 forth.

19 But most of all, I appreciate your ability to
20 carry forth what you are encouraged to take forward and, at
21 the same time, look at the project as a whole and understand
22 that we have limited dollars to do what we're going to have
23 to do. And we may not be able to get everything that you
24 want done, but it's more important that we get everything.

25 MS. PAHL: I didn't say that.

1 MR. BLACK: Well, that's the impression that
2 you gave me.

3 MS. PAHL: I failed. Thank you.

4 Linda, I appreciate very much, especially under
5 the -- some of the development ideas you talked about to
6 mitigate which, at the end of the day, won't mitigate.
7 They're going to enhance all the visitor experience that
8 will be available for visitors now in the future that come
9 to Glacier that you and your organizations are going to take
10 on the commitment to carry out what, for some of us, are
11 just an idea.

12 MS. ANDERSON: What was your name?

13 Dave, I really appreciated, first of all, getting
14 to know you. I didn't get a chance at the last two meetings
15 and, also, you brought a rationale that I think we needed,
16 because sometimes you think inside the box. You looked at
17 the mathematics of all the economics, and we need to do
18 that.

19 MR. JACKSON: Well, I really appreciate how
20 much you learned and how you're on top of it with one
21 meeting, when everybody else is just figuring out what's
22 going on. That's really incredible how fast you came in on
23 top of stuff and then started to get creative and trying to
24 help us find a common ground.

25 MS. STEWART: Thank you.

1 Don, even though we are both from the same county,
2 I like that you have a unique perspective that I don't have,
3 and I also liked you didn't tend to belabor a point and go
4 on and on; thank you.

5 MR. WHITE: Suzann, I appreciate the fact
6 that you take the time to consider some of the issues that
7 we bring forth from a Blackfeet Nation and also for
8 facilitating the little discussion groups. I don't like to
9 talk that much and take up a lot of time. As I stated in
10 the beginning, I like to keep things moving and this thing
11 gets approved and we can move on with the job.

12 MS. LEWIS: Thank you.

13 Randy, I'd like to thank you for being our chair
14 and staying with us through the third meeting and the nice,
15 calming effect you have on me when you sit to my left.

16 CHAIRMAN OGLE: It's a lot easier with
17 Virginia here.

18 Well, to Bill, as you have always brought to this
19 process your experience with the time you spent on the road
20 and, therefore, being vigilant on the practical aspects of
21 protecting the resources out there, and I've always
22 appreciated that. I think it's very helpful to our
23 discussion, so I appreciate that very much.

24 MR. DANKIN: And my footwork too.

25 CHAIRMAN OGLE: That's right.

1 MR. DANKIN: Choreography; thank you.

2 MS. TRIBE: Any closing remarks from the two
3 of you?

4 CHAIRMAN OGLE: I don't have anything more.
5 I thank everybody. I really do appreciate all the efforts,
6 especially staying up so late, all of you, Virginia, and
7 Mary and Dayna and Suzann. And thanks to the Committee for
8 all of your -- for staying with us and your thoughtful
9 comments. I appreciate it very much. Look forward to
10 seeing you in November.

11 MS. LEWIS: I would just add that I hope that
12 not only everyone on the Committee but those people who have
13 been in the audience with us for every day are, or just on
14 and off, I hope you go away feeling enriched by this
15 process, because there is so much variety and diversity, and
16 we've been able to capture that and not let it slip away
17 and not be looking for cookie-cutter processes. And I
18 appreciate that very much.

19 And I very much want to thank the staff from
20 Glacier National Park for all of their help for this
21 Committee to Mary and to Dayna and to Fred and to Denis and
22 John Kilpatrick, and all the other folks from Glacier who
23 are gone. Debbie Hervol, I thank you very much for being
24 able to sit relatively calmly as the federal official on the
25 Committee. So thank you very much.

